



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Jude 25: To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever.

O Thou eternal God, source of light and of love, in this moment of prayer may we experience the fellowship and blessings of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power.

We humbly acknowledge that in seeking the right answer to our many perplexing problems we are becoming increasingly aware of our own failings and limitations and that we need Thy guidance.

Grant that we may understand more clearly that our own spiritual life, in its simplest motive and highest manifestations would be a life of sanctity and of service.

May the social order, which we are longing and laboring to establish upon the earth, have in it the spirit of reverence for Thee, of good will toward all mankind, and mutual trust and helpfulness.

We offer our prayer in the name of Him who is our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 10, 1966, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 327. An act to amend section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8210. An act to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act with respect to the European Space Research Organization; and

H.R. 8445. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States.

CXII—178—Part 3

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House with amendments to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 9. An act to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1698. An act to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

FEBRUARY 10, 1966.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate in due form of law showing the election of WALTER B. JONES as a Representative-elect to the 89th Congress from the First Congressional District of the State of North Carolina, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Herbert C. Bonner, is on file in this office.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. JONES of North Carolina appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION BY THE HONORABLE DON FUQUA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fuqua] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, due to important business in my district, it was necessary for me to be absent for the following rollcalls: Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" for rollcall No. 11, the peacetime veterans benefits bill, and "yea" for rollcall No. 13, the Bank Merger Act amendment.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, Mr. Speaker, there is no further legislative business for this week. There are some messages to be read.

Monday is District day. There are no District bills, and no legislative business.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

For Wednesday and the remainder of the week—and I am not able to advise Members yet whether the bill will come up on Wednesday or Thursday—the only bill we can now announce is S. 1666, to provide for additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

This announcement, of course, is made subject to the usual reservation that any further program may be announced later and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, on the assumption that the Rules Committee meets, S. 1666 will be scheduled Wednesday or Thursday of next week?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I ask the distinguished majority leader if he has any additional information concerning the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966?

Mr. ALBERT. I have just been advised by the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. Speaker, that they will not be able to obtain a rule on that bill early enough to bring it up next week, so that it probably will be brought up the following week.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1966

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COLD WAR VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the so-called post-Korea GI bill has just passed in the other body by a vote of 99 to nothing, with a very minor amendment, which actually changes nothing.

All of the amendments are technical in nature except one.

In accepting this one amendment I would like to point out that under the World War II and Korea education and training programs, veterans did obtain high school training. Many thousands attended accelerated or specialized education courses offered by public schools for the purpose of completing their high school education. I expect this practice will continue under the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966. Some problems were encountered in the World War II program by a few individuals attempting to enroll and attend classes with youngsters. By concurring in this amendment I do not wish it to be inferred that I expect that practice to be tolerated. Practically all veterans, I am sure, who need high school education will obtain it in classes specially designed for adults. In those rare instances where it is necessary for the veteran to attend regular high school classes, I certainly expect the Administrator to handle these applications very carefully and grant his approval in such a manner as to preclude abuse of and to eliminate local administrative problems.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 9) to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period, with Senate amendments to the House amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 11, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out lines 3 to 12, inclusive.

Page 11, line 13, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "(e)" and insert "(d)".

Page 16, line 3, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "veterans" and insert "veteran's".

Page 22, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out lines 19, 20, and 21, and insert:

"(7) striking out in the first sentence of section 1772(a) the phrase 'under subchapter V of this chapter' and inserting in lieu thereof 'under subchapter V of chapter 35 of this title', and striking out the phrase 'this chapter' the first two times it appears in the first sentence of such section 1772(a), and each time such phrase appears in the second, third, and fourth sentences of such section 1772(a), and each time such phrase appears in section 1772(b) and in sections 1773 and 1774, and inserting in lieu thereof 'chapters 34 and 35'."

Page 31, line 17, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "programs of" and insert "program or".

Page 32, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out lines 9 and 10 and insert:

"(m) Section 1734 of such title 38 is amended by (1) striking out '33' in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof '34', and (2) striking out '1634' in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof '1684'."

Page 38, line 5, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "(b)" and insert "(2)".

Page 38, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out lines 18 to 22, inclusive, and insert:

"(c) (1) Section 2001 of title 38, United States Code, clauses (3) and (5) of section 2002 of such title, and sections 2003 and 2004 of such title are amended by inserting the phrase 'or of service after January 31, 1955' immediately after the phrase 'veterans of any war' each time such phrase appears therein.

"(2) The first sentence of section 2002 of such title 38 is amended by inserting the phrase 'or of service after January 31, 1955' immediately after the phrase 'veteran of any war'."

"(3) Clauses (1) and (4) of section 2002 of such title 38 are amended by inserting the phrase 'or of service after January 31, 1955' immediately after the phrase 'veterans of any war' each time such phrase appears in such clauses."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOLOMON N. PETCHERS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, when Solomon N. Petchers died recently, New York lost more than a philanthropist and businessman: it lost a fighter for civil liberties. The newspaper obituaries reported that he gave away almost a million dol-

lars during his lifetime. But his greatest investments were in Jewish charities, in the Hebrew Home for the Aged in Riverdale, and in the library for the blind in Jerusalem.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to count Solomon Petchers as a friend and constituent. His abiding sense of justice and his concern for humanity motivated him to play a leading role in our community. He will be greatly missed by all those who were associated with him in his many endeavors.

I knew Solomon Petchers best as the national treasurer of the American Jewish Congress. He was always at the forefront of that organization's many battles for human dignity. His own career, from Turkish immigrant to New York realtor and philanthropist, embodied what is best in mankind.

I want to take this occasion to express my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Petchers, their son Jesse, and all the other members of his family.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times and New York World Telegram and Sun paid tribute to Solomon N. Petchers in full obituaries. I wish to include them at this point in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 29, 1966]
S. N. PETCHERS, 65, DONATED MILLION—PHILANTHROPIST DIES, MADE FORTUNE IN REAL ESTATE

Solomon N. Petchers, real estate investor, manager, developer, and broker and a philanthropist who, his associates say, had given away about \$1 million, died Thursday at the Lenox Hill Hospital. He was 65 years old and lived at 200 Central Park South, with an office at 33 Riverside Drive.

Mr. Petchers, a short, heavy-set, energetic and quiet man, started in real estate in 1921, the year he came here as a poor immigrant from his native Turkey. He had been graduated from the Alliance Francaise in Istanbul and spoke English, French, Turkish, Hebrew, Yiddish, and Russian.

From his small beginnings, he rose to become sole owner and part owner, through corporations he headed and partnerships, of many business buildings and apartment houses, mostly in Manhattan, the Bronx, and Queens. Others were in Westchester County, Camden, N.J., and Inglewood, Calif.

As a youth, he worked in a real estate office during the day and taught Hebrew at night in a Jewish religious school until he began to branch out for himself with great success.

Mr. Petchers had been a crack chess player from the age of 7 until a few years ago.

He had been national treasurer of the American Jewish Congress and was a director and an associate chairman of the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York. In 1961, he received its distinguished service award.

He was a vice president and a director of the Hebrew Home for the Aged in Riverdale, the Bronx, and had been a founder and president and honorary president of its men's club. He was also a vice chairman of the home's foundation fund.

Mr. Petchers was the founder and president of the Central Library for the Blind in Jerusalem. He was also active in the development of port facilities in Ashdod, Israel, and of housing facilities for immigrants in that country.

He was a founder of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University, a director of the American Association for Jewish Education and a member of the Town Club of the City of New York and the Real Estate Board of New York.

Surviving are his widow, Mrs. Frances Sack Petchers; a son, Jesse N. Petchers of Manhattan; six brothers, Isaac N., of Los Angeles, Hyman, of Freehold, N.J., Louis, of Bayside, Queens, Benjamin, of New Rochelle, N.Y., and John Joseph, of Manhattan; four sisters, Mrs. Ruth Bukantz, Mrs. Shirley Rosen, Mrs. Mollie Hascoe, of Scarsdale, N.Y., and Mrs. Dora Kossoy, of Manhattan, and a granddaughter.

A funeral service will be held at noon tomorrow at the Riverside Memorial Chapel, Amsterdam Avenue and 76th Street.

[From the New York World Telegram and Sun, Jan. 29, 1966]

S. N. PETCHERS RITES SET; PHILANTHROPIST GAVE \$1 MILLION

Services for Solomon N. Petchers, 65, president of S. N. Realty Investments and a prominent philanthropist who gave away \$1 million, will be held tomorrow at noon at the Riverside Memorial Chapel, West 76th Street and Amsterdam Avenue.

Mr. Petchers, of 200 Central Park South, died Thursday of cancer in Lenox Hill Hospital.

A native of Turkey, Mr. Petchers came here in 1921. He worked in a real estate office during the day and taught Hebrew at a Jewish school at night.

Mr. Petchers rose to head a number of corporations in the city which controlled several business buildings and apartment houses.

An active leader in charitable and philanthropic organizations, Mr. Petchers served as national treasurer of the American Jewish Congress and as a director and associate chairman of the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York. In 1961 he received the UJA's distinguished service award.

Mr. Petchers was a founder of the Albert Einstein Medical College at Yeshiva University and was a founder and president of the Central Library for the Blind in Jerusalem.

He was also a vice president and a director of the Hebrew Home for the Aged in Riverdale, Bronx, and a founder of its men's club. He was a member of the American Association for Jewish Education, the Town Club of the City of New York and the real estate board of New York.

Mr. Petchers is survived by his widow, Frances; a son, Jesse, six brothers and four sisters.

MEDICARE DISCLAIMER

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that Robert M. Ball, Commissioner of Social Security, has advised me that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will recommend the repeal of those provisions in the medicare bill by virtue of which the Department has required the filing of disclaimer statements by persons who are not eligible for cash benefits under the social security program or the railroad retirement program.

In a letter to me yesterday, Mr. Ball stated that the Department believes "this exclusion is undesirable." He went on to say that the Department would recommend to the Congress that the provisions be repealed.

On January 10, when this session of Congress opened, I introduced a bill, H.R. 11922, to strike out these disqualifying provisions.

I urge that the House move expeditiously and pass this bill so that some 2 million elderly Americans, who might otherwise be denied much needed hospital benefits, may meet the March 31 deadline for applying for inclusion in the medicare program.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I disagree with Mr. Ball and the Social Security Administration that the medicare law specifically requires applicants to sign a disclaimer.

This requirement is based on an administrative decision and is not mandated by law. However, I certainly hope that the Congress will repeal the provisions on which the requirement is based so that this inequity can be corrected.

TAYLOR CAN HELP MIDDLE EAST

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, since there has been some criticism of my good friend and fellow townsman, Mr. Tony Taylor, of Santa Fe, N. Mex., I would like to call your attention to this editorial in the Santa Fe New Mexican, Santa Fe, N. Mex., which appeared January 28, 1966. I think it is most appropriate and certainly echoes my feelings:

TAYLOR CAN HELP MIDDLE EAST

It is widely recognized that Government service often is a losing proposition for successful business and industry leaders—whether it be for a Democratic or Republican regime. This holds true for many high officials, Members of Congress, and part-time consultants.

Such is the case of Tony Taylor, successful Santa Fe importer, who has drawn criticism from a couple of Republican Members of Congress in conjunction with a current trip to the Middle East to promote native handicrafts.

The criticism resulted from Taylor's fortune in being the brother of the First Lady, Mrs. Lady Bird Johnson. Is this relationship a valid reason to ignore Taylor's vast knowledge of handicraft importing? We think not.

Taylor has operated the Old Mexico Shop in Santa Fe for decades and is nationally recognized as a leading authority on selling of handicrafts and folk art from south of the border and across the seas. There is no doubt that his vast experience can be highly helpful to the handicraft industry of Jordan and other Middle East countries.

As for those Middle East nations, most are in serious trouble because of unfavorable balance of trade. Successful promotion of handicrafts could go a long way toward solving the trade deficits of these nations. Taylor's consultant payments of \$75 daily for the 3-week junket is a mere drop in the bucket if he can whip ease this deficit balance of trade.

Meanwhile, Taylor is paying his wife's expenses with personal funds while losing valuable time from his own business.

Would those tossing criticism send a lesser man—little versed in imports—to tackle the mountainous job? Would the critical Congressman and Congresswoman deny that each cannot break even in their own governmental service or that they could make more money in private business?

AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. This bill would restore the labor provisions of the immigration laws to the status which existed prior to December 1, 1965.

Today every alien immigrant other than one coming here in a relative status must secure a certificate from the Secretary of Labor attesting that there are insufficient workers available to perform the type of work he is engaged in and that his entry will not affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed. These provisions apply to aliens coming here from Canada, England, Europe, Asia, Central and South America—from anywhere in the world. Today, we permit 170,000 immigrants to enter the United States from all countries of the world other than Western Hemisphere countries which have no quota limitations.

The procedure set forth in the present immigration laws have bogged down our Labor Department and our Secretary of Labor with thousands of applications for certifications and have so multiplied the paperwork of labor agencies throughout the country that a Frankenstein of impracticalities has been established. Applications are required to be processed through local, city, State, regional, and national offices. The time lag in processing these applications strains the patience and endurance of employers. The employment offices throughout the country are cluttered with alien forms which take them 6 months to a year to process. Instead of devoting themselves to actual employment of persons needing jobs, these agencies are weighted down with forms and procedures which may never result in bringing jobs and applicants together.

Nothing was the matter with the old law where by blanket negative certifications, alien workers were kept out if their entry would adversely affect working conditions in the United States. The new legislation has pyramided procedures, application forms, and the work of Government employees without accomplishing any benefits to our immigration or labor practices. Instead of improving our immigration policies, the new law has stultified and degraded them. Instead of giving us an efficient, practical, and rational process, we have incorporated into the administration of the law

a dilatory, aggravating, paper pushing, and frustrating procedure.

It is necessary to return the labor provisions of our immigration laws to reason, to practicality, and to efficiency. The procedure of the immigration laws prior to December 1, 1965, was far more practical and efficient than under the present law. My amendment therefore seeks to reinstate the procedure of the laws previously in force.

PROPOSED BUDGET CUTBACKS IN SCHOOL LUNCH AND SPECIAL MILK PROGRAMS

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, the proposed budget calls for cutbacks in Public Law 874 and the National School Lunch Act and the companion program, the special milk program.

This is one of the best programs our Government has. One could say it is among the oldest of the antipoverty programs, because it aids in providing food to students of poor families throughout the Nation. And its long-range benefits are incalculable, for it aids in establishing better nutritional habits of millions of American schoolchildren.

In the Memphis school system, last year 11 million hot meals were served at a cost of 25 cents to the child. Without the assistance of the National School Lunch Act, prices would have to be raised to the point that thousands of children now buying their lunches could not afford them.

In addition to the lunch program, approximately a million free lunches are provided to Memphis children whose parents cannot afford this quarter a day charge. Any cutback in the availability of national school lunch funds would seriously reduce the number of lunches provided without charge to deserving children.

This same general argument also holds true regarding 12 million half pints of milk served each year in the Memphis city schools.

I realize that the President's message on these programs has not yet been received by the Congress. Our committees are still holding hearings on this general subject.

But I would hope that my colleagues would join in letting their opinions be known concerning any plan to cut back these programs.

REVISING AMERICAN MILITARY COMMITMENT IN EUROPE

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution which would declare the sense of the House that the President should undertake revisions of the American military commitment in Europe to enable us to withdraw such troops as may be withdrawn without jeopardizing American security.

Last week, I introduced legislation to close American ports to ships trading with North Vietnam. This week, I announced that I would seek to amend this year's foreign aid legislation to make economic aid to South Vietnam payable in scrip usable only in the United States. This would keep the AID dollars from flowing into the black market and winding up bankrolling international Vietcong intrigue.

Today, my resolution would have the effect of freeing more troops for service on the home front and southeast Asia. It would also greatly aid our balance-of-payments problem. All these measures, in my opinion, reflect measures this administration should be taking to declare its real commitment to the southeast Asian war effort.

I am not urging escalation or deescalation. I am proposing measures which show that we mean business in southeast Asia. We would show friend and foe alike that we intend to roll up our shirt-sleeves.

The resolution I introduced today speaks first of the strain on our military capability of protecting Europe while we fight an ever-more-difficult war in southeast Asia. Our European commitment clearly interferes with the strength we can bring to bear on Vietnam.

I would also hasten to point out that our European military commitment is very costly. The billions we are spending in Europe could be trimmed to bring our budget closer to balance, and help head off the need for a tax increase.

Not only is our commitment costly in budget terms, but it is costly in balance-of-payments terms. The administration has talked of success in dealing with our balance-of-payments problems. They have had about as much success in this respect as they have had in Vietnam. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have seen a mounting credibility gap with reference to the severity of our Nation's balance-of-payments problem.

Last year—in the middle of the administration's much-heralded war on balance-of-payments difficulties—this country lost \$1.6 billion in gold. This was the biggest loss of gold since 1960. I would like to tell the Members of this House which countries take this gold. It is the Spanish and the French, and indirectly, the Germans. We have almost 300,000 troops stationed in these three countries, and the dollars paid to support these troops constitute a high proportion of the dollars traded in for U.S. gold.

There is nothing like gratitude. France, Germany, and Spain, directly or indirectly, have bilked us of \$5 billion worth of gold since 1960.

Our military presence in Europe is a great boon to our allies and a great burden for the United States. This year, our commitment is helping to unbalance

our budget. It keeps our taxes high and holds out the promise of even higher taxes. But what does it do for Europe? It keeps European taxes low. It eases the strain on European budgets through minimizing defense expenditures. The European nations, in effect, subsidize their industries through the lower tax rates made possible by American provision of military defense that Europe should be paying for.

The reduced European taxes subsidize European industry, making European exports more competitive with American exports. This hurts our trade situation. We are kicking ourselves indirectly, as well as directly.

I believe that the long-range impact on our balance of payments is best where we reduce Government spending overseas rather than private investment. Private investment reduction backfires.

Another reason for reduction in the United States troop commitment to Europe is the fact that some of our NATO allies are trading with North Vietnam. The British are even supplying North Vietnam with oil. How can we expect diplomats to take our war effort seriously while we tolerate a heavy strain in keeping up the military protection of those who trade with our enemies? No one is convinced by "Uncle Sucker."

I advocate substantial troop withdrawal from Europe for another reason. If we shift some troops from Europe to Vietnam, we can meet increased military needs in Vietnam without further resort to the draft of college students and other young Americans in unusual number. There are 330,000 American military personnel in Europe. There is no reason to keep this number of personnel in Europe—and now the Vietnam war underscores that point. As long as we are keeping troops in Europe that could better be used on behalf of American interests in Vietnam, we are making our boys face a military draft so that America can protect Europe while Europe's youth escape the service Europe might otherwise require of them. I do not want American students drafted so that we might fight in Vietnam and protect Europe. I do not want American students in rice paddies while American soldiers keep Europe's young people free for wine, women, and song. Perhaps the threat of troop withdrawal would make Europe take our Vietnamese effort more seriously.

I would like to make very clear my feeling that some of our American troops are there for Europe's benefit and not ours. I know that the Defense Department was considering some troop reduction last fall. Why not now? The need is great. I do not urge the removal of any troops in Europe who are clearly protecting our interests. Let us withdraw those who are protecting European and not American interests. Retired General Gavin said just this Wednesday that "our commitments in Europe are far in excess of our needs."

What exactly is wrong with Europe protecting Europe? Our strategies which say otherwise are based on post-war military psychologies which have ceased to be realistic now that the great

Communist threat is China—at least for the moment.

I urge the House to pass this resolution and express its opinion to the President that our military commitment in Europe ought to be revised to enable withdrawal of American troops consonant with U.S. security.

THE SO-CALLED COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with the agreement on the so-called cold war GI bill. This is a tribute to one of the most able and beloved Members of the House of Representatives, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, on which I am privileged to serve, our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], who has worked so painstakingly and diligently on this matter for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, it is also a tribute to another distinguished lawmaker from the great State of Texas, the senior Senator from that State, the Honorable RALPH YARBOROUGH, who has done so much on this subject and guided the legislation so commendably through the other body.

SLASH IN IMPACT AID FUNDS MEANS MORE FEDERAL CONTROL ON SCHOOLS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn today that if the administration's plan to cut the Federal impact aid to education program is enacted that two-thirds of the fund now available to public schools in Duval County, Fla., under this program will be missing from the school budget in 1966-67.

In his budget message, President Johnson proposed to reduce the impact aid to education program from \$400 to \$200 million. This would mean to an area like Duval County, which has some 13,000 federally attached children in public schools and another 12,000 whose parents work on Federal installations in the county, that the entitlement under Public Law 874, enacted in 1951, would drop from \$1.8 million in fiscal year 1967 to \$425,000.

I have long been a supporter of the impact aid program, having been one of the original sponsors of this legislation when it was introduced in 1950. The public school system of my area asked for this program; they felt it was fair to the local community and that it was needed in order to take care of the fed-

erally attached children in the county. The uncertainty of the permanent residence of federally attached families and the vast land occupied by Federal installations causes important tax problems. In the first instance, with the temporary status of such families there is no normal tax base, and in the second instance, federally occupied and owned property is not taxable.

The local people of Duval County are solidly behind the Federal impact aid program. There are three major reasons:

First. The program is a logical one to have the Federal Government assist when it brings in the children for the county to educate while at the same time reduces the local real estate tax base.

Second. The community needs the money in order to provide adequate education for the children.

Third. The plan is not subjected to unwarranted controls from Washington.

In place of the Federal impact aid program the administration is directing its energies to another Federal aid to education program, but this one is controlled from Washington, and the local school system must fall into line in order to receive Federal aid so vitally needed across the country for public school education.

Under the new poverty-type program the school systems must think up projects and ways to spend the taxpayers' funds now available to them under the new law, and then these programs must be acted upon by Washington and they must be approved, bringing more and more Federal control over education. The end result is more Federal controls and less real assistance in the schools on an overall basis. The approved plans may in fact have little to do with lifting the overall educational facilities of the area even though more Federal dollars are spent.

This is distressing to me, and I plan to do everything in my power to retain the present impact aid to education program, which is not controlled money, to be spent in a way that the Federal Government directs. The impact aid program meets a local need caused by the presence of thousands of federally attached children, where the Federal Government has reduced the tax base available to local taxes.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial on this subject:

[From the Sentinel, Orlando (Fla.) Feb. 2, 1966]

IMPACT FUNDS MUST BE FORTHCOMING

The Budget Bureau proposes to allocate only \$183 million during fiscal 1967 to schools in communities with Government installations with large numbers of Federal workers or military personnel.

The Office of Education estimates that the need is for \$416 million in these impact funds. In central Florida, such areas as Brevard, Orange, and Seminole Counties are affected because of the Federal installations and military bases.

If Congress should slash impact funds in half, the school year might have to be shortened, particularly in a heavy impact area such as Brevard. Teacher pay might have to be reduced.

It is true that Vietnam war expense impels certain budget reductions, but in our opulent society we are not yet reduced to paying for the war out of the schoolrooms of America.

Our Florida delegation in Washington can do a great deal to see that the cut in impact funds is restored to guarantee the children of our fighting men the kind of education they deserve.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order of today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES—APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SERVE AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

FEBRUARY 8, 1966.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1966: Hon. THOMAS N. DOWNING, of Virginia; Hon. JOHN M. MURPHY, of New York; and Hon. CHARLES A. MOSHER, of Ohio.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Chairman.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES—APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SERVE AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

FEBRUARY 8, 1966.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy for the year 1966: Hon. ALTON LENNON, of North Carolina; Hon. FRANK M. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; and Hon. JAMES R. GROVER, Jr., of New York.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.
Sincerely,

EDWARD A. GARMATZ.

**REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1, 1966,
REORGANIZATION OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS FUNCTIONS IN AREA OF CIVIL RIGHTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 379)**

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganization of community relations functions in the area of civil rights.

After a careful review of the activities of the Federal agencies involved in the field of civil rights, it became clear that the elimination of duplication and undesirable overlap required the consolidation of certain functions.

As a first step, I issued Executive Orders No. 11246 and No. 11247 on September 24, 1965.

Executive Order No. 11246 simplified and clarified executive branch assignments of responsibility for enforcing civil rights policies, and placed responsibility for the Government-wide coordination of the enforcement activities of executive agencies in the Secretary of Labor with respect to employment by Federal contractors, and in the Civil Service Commission with respect to employment by Federal agencies.

Executive Order No. 11247 directed the Attorney General to assist Federal agencies in coordinating their enforcement activities with respect to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination in federally assisted programs.

As a further step for strengthening the operation and coordination of our civil rights programs, I now recommend transfer of the functions of the Community Relations Service, established in the Department of Commerce under title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to the Attorney General and transfer of the Service, including the office of Director, to the Department of Justice.

The Community Relations Service was located in the Department of Commerce by the Congress on the assumption that a primary need would be the conciliation of disputes arising out of the public accommodations title of the act. That decision was appropriate on the basis of information available at that time. The need for conciliation in this area has not been as great as anticipated because of the voluntary progress that has been made by businessmen and business organizations.

To be effective, assistance to communities in the identification and con-

ciliation of disputes should be closely and tightly coordinated. Thus, in any particular situation that arises within a community, representatives of Federal agencies whose programs are involved should coordinate their efforts through a single agency. In recent years, the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department has played such a coordinating role in many situations, and has done so with great effectiveness.

Placing the Community Relations Service within the Justice Department will enhance the ability of the Justice Department to mediate and conciliate and will insure that the Federal Government speaks with a unified voice in those tense situations where the good offices of the Federal Government are called upon to assist.

In this, as in other areas of Federal operations, we will move more surely and rapidly toward our objectives if we improve Federal organization and the arrangements for interagency coordination. The accompanying reorganization plan has that purpose.

The present distribution of Federal civil rights responsibilities clearly indicates that the activities of the Community Relations Service will fit most appropriately in the Department of Justice.

The Department of Justice has primary program responsibilities in civil rights matters and deep and broad experience in the conciliation of civil rights disputes. Congress has assigned it a major role in the implementation of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The Department of Justice performs related functions under other acts of Congress. Most of these responsibilities require not only litigation, but also efforts at persuasion, negotiation, and explanation, especially with local governments and law enforcement authorities. In addition, under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act the Department will be supporting local programs in the area of police-community relations.

The test of the effectiveness of an enforcement agency is not how many legal actions are initiated and won, but whether there is compliance with the law. Thus, every such agency necessarily engages in extensive efforts to obtain compliance with the law and the avoidance of disputes. In fact, title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires each agency concerned to attempt to obtain compliance by voluntary means before taking further action.

Among the heads of Cabinet departments the President looks principally to the Attorney General for advice and judgment on civil rights issues. The latter is expected to be familiar with civil rights problems in all parts of the Nation and to make recommendations for executive and legislative action.

The Attorney General already has responsibility with respect to a major portion of Federal conciliation efforts in the civil rights field. Under Executive Order No. 11247, he coordinates the governmentwide enforcement of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which relies heavily on the achievement of compli-

ance through persuasion and negotiation.

In the light of these facts, the accompanying reorganization plan would transfer the functions of the Community Relations Service and of its Director to the Attorney General. In so providing, the plan, of course, follows the established pattern of Federal organization by vesting all the transferred powers in the head of the Department. The Attorney General will provide for the organization of the Community Relations Service as a separate unit within the Department of Justice.

The functions transferred by the reorganization plan would be carried out with full regard for the provisions of section 1003 of title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 relating to (1) cooperation with appropriate State or local, public, or private agencies; (2) the confidentiality of information acquired with the understanding that it would be so held; and (3) the limitation on the performance of investigative or prosecutive functions by personnel of the Service.

This transfer will benefit both the Department of Justice and the Community Relations Service in the fulfillment of their existing functions.

The Attorney General will benefit in his role as the President's adviser by obtaining an opportunity to anticipate and meet problems before the need for legal action arises.

The Community Relations Service, brought into closer relationship with the Attorney General and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, will gain by becoming a primary resource in a coordinated effort in civil rights under the leadership of the Attorney General. The Community Relations Service will have direct access to the extensive information, experience, staff, and facilities within the Department and in other Federal agencies.

Finally, the responsibility for coordinating major Government activities under the Civil Rights Act aimed at voluntary and peaceful resolution of discriminatory practices will be centered in one Department. Thus, the reorganization will permit the most efficient and effective utilization of resources in this field. Together the Service and the Department will have a larger capacity for accomplishment than they do apart.

Although the reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will not of themselves result in immediate savings, the improvement achieved in administration will permit a fuller and more effective utilization of manpower and will in the future allow the performance of the affected functions at lower costs than would otherwise be possible.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 10, 1966.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the history of law enforcement in this Nation emphasizes the importance of what has been called a climate of compliance. When Americans have been in ignorance of the law, or in strong opposition to it, we have frequently faced long and difficult periods of social tension. Under such circumstances, we have often quarreled and dissipated our national strength, and weakened the quality of life in a Nation based on a system of equal justice before the law.

The Justice Department, as the chief instrument for law enforcement in the United States, has long recognized the need for citizen support of the legal process. It has also had considerable experience with conciliation as a means of eliminating long and costly litigation.

This has been particularly true of recent activities in the civil rights arena. Here, the emotionally charged atmosphere has sometimes made it difficult to secure either justice or the best interests of the community. The solution to that problem is a program for community education and communication which can reduce the need for governmental actions of a punitive nature.

The Community Relations Service was created for the purpose of carrying out such a function. It has an intimate relationship to the Justice Department's own responsibility for assuring the civil rights of all American citizens. There is a natural link between the two efforts. A Community Relations Service within the Justice Department can anticipate conflict. It can work to prevent the escalation of conflict. Located within the Department of Justice, it can recommend alternative solutions for the wide range of problems which come to the Attorney General. And it can give the Attorney General competent professional assistance in implementing any such recommendations.

It is also worth noting that there is nothing unusual about conciliation or mediation functions being housed within the agency which also has the enforcement responsibilities. For example, more than 20 of the 28 States which have established civil rights agencies house both the conciliation and the enforcement responsibility within the same agency. This is also true with respect to more than 30 city agencies across the country.

The Justice Department, with its specific charge to coordinate title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, is in particular need of a resource such as the Community Relations Service to bring about community understanding and commitment to the principle of equality guaranteed by the civil rights law. The Community Relations Service, which has the skills to accomplish this, merits the opportunity to use them within that Department of Government most vitally

concerned and involved in achieving this goal.

For all these reasons, I urge support of the President's reorganization plan transferring the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Justice Department.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, there is a serious need for reorganizing the structure and functions of civil rights efforts within the executive branch of the Federal Government. The President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 is in line with that need. This proposes transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice.

There is need to deal with all aspects of civil rights problems as the interlocking unity they are—both in elimination of basic causes of civil rights strife and in enforcement and implementation of civil rights orders, laws, and judicial decisions. By Executive order, the Attorney General now has some responsibility for coordinating civil rights activities within the executive branch. He is also the President's principal adviser in civil rights matters. The Community Relations Service, because of its experience and knowledge of the problems of the whole community, can render invaluable service to the Attorney General by constantly keeping before him the interlocking nature of these problems.

There is also a need for the Attorney General to have additional resources at his command, with a broader range of alternative actions, in civil rights matters. Community disputes, disagreements, and difficulties arising from discrimination and local tradition are not always covered by Federal law but are nevertheless disruptive of racial harmony and retard compliance with the law. The Community Relations Service can furnish the Attorney General with just such an alternative action.

For these reasons, I support President Johnson's reorganization plan. It makes sense and I urge that we give it our approval.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has submitted Reorganization Plan No. 1 to the Congress, proposing to transfer the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice. I wish to speak briefly in support of that measure.

I have followed the work of the Community Relations Service from its first days in 1964, both in its activities in the South and in the larger urban centers of the North. In this brief period, the Service has demonstrated its value in encouraging communities to move voluntarily toward compliance with the law. The transfer to the Department

of Justice will serve to enhance this value.

Since the passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964, there has been a need for coordination of the various governmental activities in the field of civil rights. The President acted to meet this need last fall by assigning to the Attorney General the responsibility of supervising enforcement by all Federal agencies of title VI of the act. The Attorney General already had a major responsibility in the civil rights area as the officer charged with enforcement of civil rights legislation through litigation in the courts. Now, by making Community Relations Service a part of Justice, we will further advance the coordination of the Federal involvement in civil rights.

Some have questioned whether the move observes the desire of Congress to separate the conciliation function from the prosecutive activities of the Department of Justice. This separation, however, is not destroyed by the transfer. The Community Relations Service will not, under the plan, become a subordinate part of the Civil Rights Division of the Department, which is engaged in enforcement litigation.

The Service will be a separate internal unit, coordinate to the Civil Rights Division, with both units reporting directly to the Attorney General or his deputy. The prohibition in the act against participation of CRS personnel in litigation against violators will still be applicable, insuring, as Congress intended, that CRS personnel will not aid in the prosecution of a case in which they have previously been active for the Service.

This I am convinced, that the plan will increase the effectiveness of the Community Relations Service and of the Federal Government in dealing with the Nation's major domestic problem. I urge that the Congress permit it to become effective.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND
REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FOR A WORLD AT PEACE—WORLD-
WIDE COOPERATION TO SUPPLY
MANKIND WITH FOOD, CLOTHING,
AND SHELTER—MESSAGE FROM
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES (H. DOC. NO. 378)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

Men first joined together for the necessities of life—food for their families, clothing to protect them, housing to give them shelter.

These are the essentials of peace and progress.

But in the world today, these needs are still largely unfulfilled.

When men and their families are hungry, poorly clad, and ill-housed, the world is restless—and civilization exists at best in troubled peace.

A WAR ON HUNGER

Hunger poisons the mind. It saps the body. It destroys hope. It is the natural enemy of every man on earth.

I propose that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger.

There can only be victors in this war. Since every nation will share in that victory, every nation should share in its costs. I urge all who can help to join us.

A PROGRAM FOR MANKIND

The program I am submitting to Congress today, together with the proposals set forth in my message on foreign assistance, look to a world in which no man, woman, or child need suffer want of food or clothing.

The key to victory is self-help.

Aid must be accompanied by a major effort on the part of those who receive it. Unless it is, more harm than good can be the end result.

I propose:

1. Expanded food shipments to countries where food needs are growing and self-help efforts are underway.

Even with their maximum efforts abroad, our food aid will be needed for many years to come.

2. Increased capital and technical assistance.

Thus, self-help will bear fruit through increased farm production.

3. Elimination of the surplus concept in food aid.

Current farm programs are eliminating the surpluses in our warehouses. Fortunately the same programs are flexible enough to gear farm production to amounts that can be used constructively.

4. Continued expansion of markets for American agricultural commodities.

Increased purchasing power, among the hundreds of millions of consumers in developing countries, will help them become good customers of the American farmer.

5. Increasing emphasis on nutrition, especially for the young.

We will continue to encourage private industry, in cooperation with the Government, to produce and distribute foods to combat malnutrition.

6. Provision for adequate reserves of essential food commodities.

Our reserves must be large enough to serve as a stabilizing influence and to meet any emergency.

AMERICA'S PAST EFFORTS

This program keeps faith with policies this Nation has followed since President Franklin D. Roosevelt proclaimed the four freedoms of mankind.

After World War II, we helped to make Europe free from want. We carried out on that Continent massive programs of relief, reconstruction and development.

This great effort—the Marshall plan—was followed by President Truman's point 4, President Eisenhower's Act of Bogotá and its successor, President Ken-

nedy's Alliance for Progress. Under these programs we have provided technical and capital assistance to the developing nations.

Our food aid programs have brought over 140 million tons of food to hungry people during the past decade.

Hunger, malnutrition, and famine have been averted.

Schools and hospitals have been built.

Seventy million children now receive American food in school lunch and family and child feeding programs.

Nevertheless the problem of world hunger is more serious today than ever before.

A BALANCE IS REQUIRED

One new element in today's world is the threat of mass hunger and starvation. Populations are exploding under the impact of sharp cuts in the death rate. Successful public health measures have saved millions of lives. But these lives are now threatened by hunger because food production has not kept pace.

A balance between agricultural productivity and population is necessary to prevent the shadow of hunger from becoming a nightmare of famine. In my message on international health and education, I described our increased efforts to help deal with the population problem.

IMPROVING LOCAL AGRICULTURE

Many of the developing countries urgently need to give a higher priority to improving and modernizing their own production and distribution of food. The overwhelming majority of these who till the soil still use the primitive methods of their ancestors. They produce little more than enough to meet their own needs, and remain outside the market economy.

History has taught us that lack of agricultural development can cripple economic growth.

The developing countries must make basic improvements in their own agriculture.

They must bring the great majority of their people—now living in rural areas—into the market economy.

They must make the farmer a better customer of urban industry and thus accelerate the pace of economic development.

They must begin to provide all of their people with the food they need.

They must increase their exports, and earn the foreign exchange to purchase the foods and other goods which they themselves cannot produce efficiently.

In some developing countries, marked improvement is already taking place. Taiwan and Greece are raising their food output and becoming better cash customers for our food exports every year. Others have made a good beginning in improving agricultural production.

THE NEED FOR SELF-HELP

There is one characteristic common to all those who have increased the productivity of their farms: a national will and determination to help themselves.

We know what would happen if increased aid were dispensed without regard to measures of self-help. Eco-

nomics incentives for higher production would disappear. Local agriculture would decline as dependence upon United States food increased.

Such a course would lead to disaster.

Disaster could be postponed for a decade or even two—but it could not be avoided. It could be postponed if the United States were to produce at full capacity and if we financed the massive shipments needed to fill an ever-growing deficit in the hungry nations.

But ultimately those nations would pay an exorbitant cost. They would pay it not only in money, but in years and lives wasted. If our food aid programs serve only as a crutch, they will encourage the developing nations to neglect improvements they must make in their own production of food.

For the sake of those we would aid, we must not take that course.

We shall not take that course.

But candor requires that I warn you the time is not far off when all the combined production, on all of the acres, of all of the agriculturally productive nations, will not meet the food needs of the developing nations—unless present trends are changed.

Dependence on American aid will not bring about such a change.

The program I present today is designed to bring about that change.

BETTER NUTRITION

Beyond simple hunger, there lies the problem of malnutrition.

We know that nutritional deficiencies are a major contributing cause to a death rate among infants and young children that is 30 times higher in developing countries than in advanced areas.

Protein and vitamin deficiencies during preschool years leave indelible scars.

Millions have died. Millions have been handicapped for life—physically or mentally.

Malnutrition saps a child's ability to learn. It weakens a nation's ability to progress. It can—and must—be attacked vigorously.

We are already increasing the nutritional content of our food aid contributions. We are working with private industry to produce and market nutritionally rich foods. We must encourage and assist the developing countries themselves to expand their production and use of such foods.

The wonders of modern science must also be directed to the fight against malnutrition. I have today directed the President's Science Advisory Committee to work with the very best talent in this Nation to search out new ways to:

Develop inexpensive, high-quality synthetic foods as dietary supplements. A promising start has already been made in isolating protein sources from fish, which are in plentiful supply throughout the world.

Improve the quality and the nutritional content of food crops.

Apply all of the resources of technology to increasing food production.

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR OUR ABUNDANCE

Our farm programs must reflect changing conditions in the United States and the world. Congress has provided—

For American farmers, a continuing prospect of rising incomes.

For American consumers, assurance of an abundance of high-quality food at fair prices.

For American taxpayers, less dollars spent to stockpile commodities in quantities greater than those needed for essential reserves.

Today—because of the world's needs, and because of the changing picture of U.S. agriculture—our food aid programs can no longer be governed by surpluses. The productive capacity of American agriculture can and should produce enough food and fiber to provide for:

1. Domestic needs.
2. Commercial exports.
3. Food aid to those developing countries that are determined to help themselves.
4. Reserves adequate to meet any emergency, and to stabilize prices.

To meet these needs, I am today directing the Secretary of Agriculture to:

1. Increase the 1966 acreage allotment for rice by 10 percent.

Unprecedented demands arising out of drought and war in Asia require us to increase our rice crop this year. I know that our farmers will respond to this need, and that the Congress will understand the emergency that requires this temporary response.

2. Buy limited amounts of dairy products under the authority of the 1965 act.

We must have adequate supplies of dairy products for commercial markets, and to meet high priority domestic and foreign program needs. Milk from U.S. farms is the only milk available to millions of poor children abroad. The Secretary will use authority in the 1965 act whenever necessary to meet our needs for dairy products.

3. Take actions that will increase soybean production in 1966.

The demand for soybeans has climbed each year since 1960. Despite record crops, we have virtually no reserve stocks. To assure adequate supplies at prices fair to farmers and consumers, the Secretary of Agriculture will use authority under the 1965 act to encourage production of soybeans on acreage formerly planted to feed grains. Feed grain stocks are more than sufficient.

These actions supplement earlier decisions to increase this year's production of wheat and barley. Although our present reserves of wheat are adequate to meet all likely shipments, the Secretary of Agriculture has suspended programs for voluntary diversion of additional spring wheat plantings.

Our 60 million acres now diverted to conservation uses represent the major emergency reserve that could readily be called forth in the critical race between food and population. We will bring these acres back into production as needed—but not to produce unwanted surplus, and not to supplant the efforts of other countries to develop their own agricultural economies.

These actions illustrate how our domestic farm program will place the American farmer in the front ranks in the worldwide war on hunger.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

I recommend a new Food for Freedom Act that retains the best provisions of Public Law 480, and that will:

Make self-help an integral part of our food aid program.

Eliminate the surplus requirement for food aid.

Emphasize the development of markets for American farm products.

Authorize greater food aid shipments than the current rate.

Emphasize the building of cash markets and the shift toward financing food aid through long-term dollar credits rather than sales for foreign currencies. Except for U.S. requirements, we look to the completion of that shift by the end of 5 years.

Continue to finance the food aid program under the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Increase emphasis on combating malnutrition. The act will authorize the CCC to finance the enrichment of foods.

Continue to work with voluntary agencies in people-to-people assistance programs.

Provide for better coordination of food aid with other economic assistance.

FOOD AND FIBER RESERVES

I recommend a program to establish the principle of the ever-normal granary by providing for food and fiber reserves.

This program supplements food for freedom.

It establishes a reserve policy that will protect the American people from unstable supplies of food and fiber, and from high prices in times of emergency.

The legislation I recommend to the Congress will enable us to draw strength from two great related assets:

The productive genius of our farmers.

The potential that lies in the 60 million acres now withdrawn from production.

In case of need, most of those acres could be brought back into productive farming within 12 to 18 months. But because of the seasonal nature of farming time would be needed to expand production even under the flexible provisions of the Agriculture Act of 1965. Therefore we need a reserve to bridge this gap.

We have been able to operate without a specific commodity reserve policy in recent years, because the surpluses built up in the 1950's exceeded our reserve needs. This condition has almost run its course.

Under present law, the Secretary of Agriculture must dispose of all stocks of agricultural commodities as rapidly as possible, consistent with orderly marketing procedures. As we continue to reduce our surpluses we need to amend the law to authorize the maintenance of reserve stocks.

The act I recommend will do that.

It will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish minimum reserve levels. Under the act, he must take into account normal trade stocks, consumer and farm prices, domestic and export requirements, crop yield variations and commitments under our domestic and foreign food programs.

The reserve would be used to meet priority needs, under prices and conditions to be determined within the broad guidelines established by existing law.

The act could be implemented in the year ahead without any additional cost to the Government. We are still reducing our surpluses of most agricultural commodities. During the first year of the new program, it is not likely that we will have to purchase any commodity to build up a reserve.

Under the two acts I recommended today, with the farm legislation now on the statute books—and with the foreign assistance program I have recommended—we will be able to make maximum use of the productivity of our farms.

We can make our technology and skills powerful instruments for agricultural progress throughout the world—wherever men commit themselves to the task of feeding the hungry.

A UNIFIED EFFORT

To strengthen these programs our food aid and economic assistance must be closely linked. Together they must relate to efforts in developing countries to improve their own agriculture. The Departments of State and Agriculture and the Agency for International Development will work together, even more closely than they have in the past, in the planning and implementing of coordinated programs.

In the past few years AID has called upon the Department of Agriculture to assume increasing responsibilities through its International Agricultural Development Service. That policy will become even more important as we increase our emphasis on assisting developing nations to help themselves.

Under the Food for Freedom Act, the Secretary of Agriculture will continue to have authority to determine the commodities available. He will act only after consulting with the Secretary of State on the foreign policy aspects of food aid and with other interested agencies.

We must extend to world problems in food and agriculture the kind of cooperative relationships we have developed with the States, universities, farm organizations, and private industry.

AN INTERNATIONAL EFFORT

It is not enough that we unify our own efforts. We cannot meet this problem alone.

Hunger is a world problem. It must be dealt with by the world.

We must encourage a truly international effort to combat hunger and modernize agriculture.

We shall work to strengthen the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The efforts of the multilateral lending organizations, and of the United Nations development program should be expanded—particularly in food and agriculture.

We are prepared to increase our participation in regional as well as worldwide multilateral efforts, wherever they provide efficient technical assistance and make real contributions to increasing the food-growing capacities of the developing nations. For example, we will undertake

a greatly increased effort to assist improvements in rice yields in the rice-eating less-developed countries, as part of our cooperation with FAO during this International Rice Year.

FOR A WORLD AT PEACE

The program I recommend today will raise a new standard of aid for the hungry, and for world agriculture.

It proclaims our commitment to a better world society—where every person can hope for life's essentials—and be able to find them in peace.

It proclaims the interdependence of mankind in its quest for food and clothing and shelter.

It is built on three universal truths:

That agriculture is an essential pursuit of every nation,

That an abundant harvest is not only a gift of God, but also the product of man's skill and determination and commitment,

That hunger and want—anywhere—are the eternal enemies of all mankind.

I urge Congress to consider and debate these suggestions thoroughly and wisely in the hope and belief we can from them fashion a program that will keep free-men free, and at the same time share our leadership and agricultural resources with our less blessed brothers throughout the world.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 10, 1966.

TRANSITION TO LONG-TERM DOLLAR CREDIT

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important features of the President's new food-for-freedom program is its emphasis on systematic and orderly transition from the stage in which a recipient country pays for food aid only in local currency to the stage in which it buys on long-term credit payable in dollars.

To those familiar with the past Public Law 480 program, this means a transition from the title I approach to the title IV approach. Title IV is the Poage amendment and was added to the law several years ago.

This long-term dollar credit feature is an important part of the food-for-freedom program. It recognizes that many nations which have promising basic economies may not be able to buy our farm products on short-term commercial credit at this time, but can afford to buy when long-term credit is made available.

This program is growing. Last year it accounted for well over \$200 million of export sales. Several countries have become dollar customers for part or all of their purchases through this route. Greece is on that list. So are Yugoslavia, Iran, Iraq, Formosa, Portugal, and some of the Latin American republics,

and, of course, our best customer, Japan, was in the process of transition just at the time this amendment was put in the law. Today Japan is our best dollar market and she is now paying cash. As the nations of the world develop economically, we can sell more food for dollars and we can collect more dollars in cash. Our greatest sales are to the developed countries. Let us never fear that it will injure our trade to develop the productive capacity of other countries.

Experience has shown that the shift to long-term credit can be made successfully, but only as the underdeveloped country builds its own economy. I think that it would be a mistake to confuse emergency shipments of food to starving people with long-time market development. We can increase markets—dollar markets—but we will not do it simply by increasing our gifts to India or any other country, no matter how proper those gifts may be at the moment. I look upon the gift provisions of this program as temporary provisions. I foresee in the dollar sales provision an opportunity to expand American business on a permanent basis. Both are needed, and I understand the President envisions both.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM—NEW AND ENRICHED FOODS

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, because of its departure from the surplus disposal concept, the President's new food for freedom will provide for much greater flexibility in the commodities offered through the program. It will also enable us to introduce enriched and fortified foods that will greatly step up the nutritional contributions of the program.

Nonfat milk distributed under the program, for example, can be enriched with vitamins A and D. Wheat flour and cornmeal can be fortified with calcium, fats and oils with vitamin A, and cereals with vitamin B⁶. Many other fortification possibilities that have been explored on an experimental or limited basis can now be expanded.

It will also be possible to introduce new foods with special nutritive qualities. For example, there has already been a favorable reaction in pilot programs to Ceplapro, a corn-based formulated food. Consideration has been given to including fish protein concentrate in the program. Tests have been made with a beverage made from soybeans for infant feeding.

The President's new program will make it possible to go ahead with these and a variety of other nutritional improvements. This is a modern, forward-looking proposal which deserves our full support.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM—THE IMPORTANCE OF CHILD NUTRITION

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the merits of the President's new food-for-freedom program is its approach to the worldwide problems of poorly fed children.

We know from our own experience that how we bring up our own children—through good schools, good meals, and good homes—determines the kind of citizens and the kind of nation we will have in the years ahead. Exactly the same thing is true in foreign nations. What happens to their children today determines the shape of those nations tomorrow.

More and more we are coming to realize that adequate nutrition is a basic key to child development. Scientists are finding that proteins are the building blocks of brains, bodies, and abilities in the growing child. Deny a child the essential proteins and his potential as a human being may never be fully realized. Let him have the proteins he needs, and the accompanying essentials of a balanced diet, and he has the opportunity then to absorb knowledge, to become physically and mentally vigorous, and to become the kind of active citizen a developing country requires.

We are doing much through present programs to help bring improved diets to children of other countries. More than 40 million children in such countries are eating school lunches made up in part of foods from the United States. But more needs to be done—not necessarily by us but more in joint projects or more by the countries themselves. The President's new program will give flexibility, it will give new emphasis, it will provide even better ways of bringing about progress in this highly important area of building tomorrow's citizens.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM—EMPHASIS ON SELF-HELP

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the President's new food-for-freedom program for the assurance it gives that recipients of food aid will undertake, or continue, efforts to help themselves by improving their own agricultural systems.

There is a danger in any assistance program that the recipient will fail to face up to reality, will come to look upon assistance as the natural state of affairs, and will make insufficient efforts to help himself. We all know this can happen

to people. It can happen to nations, as well.

If the food-for-peace program of the past has had this weakness, it is the President's obvious intention to eliminate it in the future.

We must never be in a position where the advanced state of our own agricultural technology substitutes for and in fact stands in the way of the development of a sound agriculture in the countries with which we share our bounty. For the time would certainly come when not even our own vast resources would be enough to feed the world's growing population.

The President's new food-for-freedom program, with its emphasis on self-help, assures that the developing nations will take greater steps toward self-sufficiency.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, the message submitted by the President to the Congress today is a historic one. It brings into sharp focus our deep concern with mankind's eternal struggle to provide enough food for life and to allay the elemental fear of famine.

It is entirely proper that we should commit ourselves to eradicate hunger from the world. Man has, at last, the knowledge to do so. It is our responsibility to help make this knowledge available and put it into practice. This the President proposes to do.

But the President has called our attention not only to the hunger that prevails in so much of the world today, but also to the race we are in: The race to expand the food production of the world more rapidly than the rate at which the world's population is growing. So far, we have not succeeded in this. But it is a race that we must win. For the alternative is continued famine and starvation for individuals and the social and political turmoil for the nations in which food shortages occur. Peace and progress for the world depend upon a diffusion of agricultural technology, but this can have no positive effect if something is not done, on a massive basis, to cope with the onrushing population explosion.

The proposals made by the President for utilizing our own agricultural potential to help other nations in developing their agricultural resources are sound. It is proper that currencies generated by sales of food, which are not convertible into dollars, be used to assist in developing agriculture in the participating countries. For such a provision means that the program not only treats the immediate symptoms but also opens the way to the longrun solution of the problem of famine.

Mr. Speaker, close relationship of onrushing famine and exploding population growth prompts me to make an additional suggestion. A portion of the soft currency funds generated by this pro-

gram—say 15 percent—could be set aside, in the manner of Cooley funds, to be made available at the wish of governments involved, for maternal and child health care, with a substantial emphasis on family planning and health programs.

Such funds could be administered through a number of agencies. One which seems particularly appropriate would be the World Health Organization, which has become increasingly concerned with family planning and child care.

Just as techniques of agriculture have improved to make it possible to feed the present population of the world, techniques of family planning have been developed and tested which make it possible to control the population explosion, without impinging on individual conscience or religious conviction. By bringing together agricultural development and family planning by using nonconvertible funds generated in the food-for-peace program, we may well have set the stage for fulfilling human hopes for security against famine, within the next generation.

DEATH OF JOSEPH RUSSELL KNOWLAND

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to the House the death of the Honorable Joseph Russell Knowland, the father of Senator William Knowland, who was Republican floor leader of the Senate until a few years ago. Mr. Knowland lived in Piedmont, Calif.

Mr. Knowland served in the House of Representatives from November 8, 1904, until March 3, 1915, when he was an unsuccessful candidate for election to the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Knowland was a publisher of the Oakland Tribune and was noted for the work that he did as a member of the Beaches and Parks Commission in California, in preserving for future posterity the beauty spots of our State, and for his great work in the field of western history.

Although of a different political persuasion—and the Knowland papers have never supported me—I recognize in Joseph Russell Knowland a great American and a great patriot, a man who has made a great contribution to his country, and I regretfully inform the House of his passing.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from California yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Although I never met, and consequently never knew, Joseph Knowland, I had heard a great deal about his distinguished career in the Congress of the United States. He was, as everyone knows, the father of a

former Senator from the State of California. This is a fine family of dedicated Americans, and I join with the gentleman from California in expressing our sorrow and deepest condolences to the family.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ENROLLMENT IN PROGRAM OF SUPPLEMENTAL MEDICAL INSURANCE BENEFITS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend to June 30, 1966, the period for initial enrollment in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of this title.

The section of the Social Security Act dealing with the voluntary medicare program is rather important as it is available to all citizens 65 and over. However, since only 11.5 million of our senior citizens have enrolled in this program to date, it is apparent that there has not been enough time to adequately inform qualified individuals of the details of the program or of the financial responsibilities involved. In addition, if a qualified person does not sign up by the deadline, he must wait 2 years before he is again eligible to participate.

This is of particular concern to me as some 50,000 of my constituents might qualify for this program. Of these, almost 15 percent do not receive social security benefits and therefore have not been formally notified of the opportunities available to them under the supplemental medical insurance program. It seems unrealistic to believe that this complicated program can be fully explained to these individuals in the short time remaining before the presently scheduled termination of the enrollment period March 31.

Thus I am introducing this bill today in hopes that those individuals already contacted might have additional time to consider the program and that additional time might be made available to explain its details to those who have not yet been contacted. I hope this bill will receive favorable consideration by the committee to which it is referred and by each Member of Congress.

EQUALITY UNDER THE LAW

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to

further protect the rights and privileges of our Nation's citizens from discrimination on the basis of sex. This measure is strongly supported by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

While the rights of various minority groups throughout the country have received considerable attention of late, those of a far larger group also need attention. Discrimination on the basis of sex has plagued primarily the women of the Nation and has by no means been eliminated. Today's women participate in virtually every field of endeavor, many holding positions of great authority and responsibility. Yet in some sectors of the country the fairer sex does not always enjoy an equal opportunity to fair competition.

The amendment introduced by this joint resolution would provide means by which the rights of these citizens might be further protected. I urge my colleagues in both bodies of Congress to join in support of this measure, which is of such interest to the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, as the following letter from Miss Emma C. McGall, national legislation chairman, of Westfield, N.J., attests. I include as part of my remarks this letter as well as the text of the joint resolution.

THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC. OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1966.

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIDNALL: It was a pleasure to be able to meet with you at the breakfast on Thursday, January 26, during the course of the National Legislative Conference of our federation. This was a very auspicious beginning to a most successful conference and it was a pleasure to be with you and to talk with you at this occasion.

In accordance with his promise Congressman PAUL KREBS introduced on January 26, House Joint Resolution 816 providing for the equal rights amendment to the U.S. Constitution. If you have not already done so the members in our New Jersey federation, and particularly the members in your congressional district, would be most appreciative of your introducing a similar joint resolution.

Thanking you for taking time out of your very busy schedule to be with us, I am

Sincerely yours,

(Miss) EMMA C. MCGALL,
National Legislation Chairman.

H.J. RES. 834

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall

have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"Sec. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

"Sec. 3. This amendment shall take effect one year after the date of ratification."

ANNUAL PRESIDENTIAL TRADE POLICY REPORT SHOULD BE TIMELY, NOT A YEAR LATE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the President's ninth annual report on the trade agreements program for 1964, prepared by his special representative for trade negotiations, was sent to the Congress in final form in the first week of the current year, 1966, even though the President's letter of transmittal was signed on October 31, 1965. This report is required by section 402(a) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1803 (a)), which reads:

The President shall submit to the Congress an annual report on the trade agreements program and on tariff adjustment and other adjustment assistance under this chapter. Such report shall include information regarding new negotiations, changes made in duties and other import restrictions of the United States, reciprocal concessions obtained, changes in trade agreements in order to effectuate more fully the purposes of the trade agreements program (including the incorporation therein of escape clauses), the results of action taken to obtain removal of foreign trade restrictions (including discriminatory restrictions) against U.S. exports, remaining restrictions, and the measures available to seek their removal in accordance with the purposes of this chapter, and other information relating to the trade agreements program and to the agreements entered into thereunder.

No date is fixed in this section by which the President shall submit to Congress his annual trade report.

It is reasonable to assume, however, that the intent of Congress when enacting the Trade Expansion Act was to have available at the beginning of a calendar year a comprehensive report on the trade agreements program for the year immediately past. Congress would expect this report at the beginning of the year because it would then have before it information on which to base legislative decisions having to do with foreign trade during the current year. Accordingly, the President's trade report for calendar 1964 should have been received in final form in Congress at least within the first 3 months of 1965.

Thus, I am introducing today a bill to amend section 402 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 by inserting immediately after "Such report" in the second sentence the following:

shall be submitted on or before March 31 of each year and

This very simple amendment would make explicit the intent of Congress that it have available for reference and use early in each year the President's report on trade for the previous year. As evidence of the need for this amendment I cite the fact that since 1960 no trade report has been submitted before July 1. Incredibly, President Kennedy's report for 1961 was not transmitted to Congress until January 28, 1963.

The trade report is not only an important document through which the Congress can judge the operations of the Executive in this important field, it is also necessary for congressional decision-making. The trade report can in addition be an important vehicle for public information especially at present, when U.S. international trade negotiations are widely followed and the subject of public interest—if only by virtue of the name "Kennedy round." It would be source material for articles and papers prepared at the academic level as well as in the thousand-odd trade and professional associations and unions which have a deep interest in foreign trade and the U.S. trade agreements program. Of course, such an annual report is useless if it is a full year late, or even 9 months late. By that time the consumers of such information have gone to other, perhaps less dependable sources for information about the previous year's foreign trade program.

TOM CURTIS' CONTRIBUTION TO DEBATE ON THE BUDGET AND INFLATION.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the February 8 Washington Post praises my colleague, Tom CURTIS, Republican, of St. Louis County, Mo., "for performing a most useful function by subjecting the administration's budget to the scrutiny that it deserves in a period of great uncertainty."

Representative CURTIS has argued throughout the just ended Joint Economic Committee hearings on the President's Economic Report that inflation is now in progress due in part to the existence of high spending since September to support both a war economy and costly domestic programs, and is reflected in the rising wholesale price index. CURTIS argues that the fiscal year 1967 budget, and the revised fiscal year 1966 budget which increased the Federal deficit from \$3.9 to \$6.9 billion, is highly unrealistic in terms of the goal of price stability that the President and his Council of Economic Advisers claim to be seeking. In spite of the inability of administration witnesses to reconcile their stated goal with a budget that they have been forced under cross-examination to admit is potentially highly inflationary, officials refuse to concede that

inflation is in fact a clear and present danger.

Though the Washington Post disagrees with CURTIS, it has recognized the important—indeed crucial—function played in national decisionmaking by a loyal opposition, and cites TOM CURTIS' contribution to this process through his aggressive leadership and presentation of opposition viewpoints as "the leading Republican spokesman on economic affairs."

Following is the complete text of the editorial:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 8, 1966]

THE BUDGET AND INFLATION

If the current hearings before the Joint Economic Committee foreshadow future debate, the issue that separates Republicans from Democrats will be inflation. Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS of Missouri, the leading Republican spokesman on economic affairs believes that the rise in Federal expenditures for the current fiscal year has already resulted in inflationary pressures, and he charges that the administration's 1967 budget will further intensify them. The administration, through the testimony of Budget Director Charles L. Schultze and Treasury Secretary Henry H. Fowler, has counterattacked by denying that the current price increases are inflationary or that they are related to the budgetary deficit.

In replying to Representative CURTIS on the issue of prices, Schultze argued that the recent rise in the wholesale price index is principally the result of increases in the prices of agricultural commodities. Since farm prices are still somewhat below the high point reached in 1958, Schultze maintains that the increase in the wholesale price index is "not an inflationary phenomenon. It is a cyclical phenomenon."

Without quarreling over the term "cyclical"—over whether farm prices as a whole are subject to distinct cycles, it is sufficient to note that agricultural commodity prices are far more responsive to shifts in supply and demand than the prices of manufacturers. Therefore, the increases in agricultural prices that are experienced when aggregate demand expands rapidly may be ephemeral. To the extent that they are, Schultze's argument makes good sense. But there is, of course, always the danger that the rise in agricultural prices can affect nonfarm prices through their impact on wages.

On the second issue of whether the budgetary deficit for fiscal 1966 has contributed to inflationary pressures, the administration clearly has the better of the argument. But in awarding it points for debating, the administration must be faulted for the weakness of its defense against potential inflationary pressures.

It was refreshing to hear a Secretary of the Treasury warn the opposition, that "We have seen too many expansions turned into recessions by slamming too hard on the brakes." But Mr. Fowler's declarations about the administration's willingness to apply the brakes at the propitious moment would be more convincing if he were to make some specific proposals for a first line of fiscal defense. The 1967 budget, being approximately in balance is at best "neutral," neither augmenting nor diminishing the total stream of expenditures.

But that neutrality may be a serious weakness if excessive demands for goods and services develop. In that event, what will be needed is a neutralizing budget, a tight budget that absorbs the gap between aggregate demand and supply by incurring a substantial surplus. Two steps can be taken in advance of the forces of excessive demand. Congress should be asked to enact income tax increases without specifying an effective

date. Action to raise taxes at the propitious moment can then take the form of a joint resolution. And Secretary Fowler's remarks to the contrary notwithstanding, action should be taken now to modify or temporarily suspend the 7 percent tax credit for business investment enacted in 1962. Tax incentives to invest are not needed in a year when outlays on plant and equipment are scheduled to rise by 15 percent.

Even where his line of reasoning misses the mark, Representative CURTIS is performing a most useful function by subjecting the administration's budget to the scrutiny that it deserves in a period of great uncertainty.

FREEMAN ADMITS HE WAS WRONG

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of one-price cotton legislation in 1964 I repeatedly warned that the bill advocated by the Johnson administration would be costly and ineffective, and would not benefit consumers. The facts now bear out my warning.

Secretary Freeman in 1964 took the opposite view. He predicted better prices for consumers, increased domestic consumption of cotton and lower costs to the taxpayer. In one of the most impressive displays of legislative arm twisting in history administration forces pushed the bill and hooked it to another legislative mistake, the wheat certificate program.

It is somewhat gratifying, therefore, to see that Secretary Freeman now admits he was wrong. He did so in a speech to the American Textile Manufacturers Institute January 27 in New York City.

Part of Mr. Freeman's speech is devoted to glowing predictions about the future success of the 1965 cotton bill—predictions which echo his erroneous forecast of the year before. Next year, no doubt, Mr. Freeman will belatedly explain to the long-suffering taxpayers that he was wrong in 1965, too.

Now the same administration which was so wrong about cotton legislation in 1964 in trying to put through more cotton legislation, this time a compulsory checkoff to finance additional research and promotion.

Here is Mr. Freeman's speech text:

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, BEFORE THE AMERICAN TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE, JANUARY 27, 1966

I have looked forward for some time for this chance to be together with you. It provides us an opportunity to discuss together some matters of mutual interest.

I am glad that I can meet here with you in these good times. We are in the midst of the longest sustained business prosperity in our peacetime history.

Only yesterday the Secretary of Labor predicted that the unemployment rate would be in the neighborhood of 3.5 percent by the end of June. This would be the lowest unemployment rate since 1953 and one of the lowest in the Nation's history.

More than 70 million people are gainfully employed in our country—a figure that was laughed at when predictions were made in

past years that we would reach this level of employment.

Corporation profits last year were 20 percent up after taxes, and up 67 percent from 1960. Our gross national product will top \$720 billion—a figure undreamed of a few years ago.

I am pleased when I look back over 1965 and see that net farm income was the best in 12 years; that per farm income is at record levels—and that 1966 promises to be even better.

This prosperity was not an accident. Since 1961 there has been a conscious effort on the part of the administration to bring about a cooperative effort between business and Government to develop programs and take administrative action to bring about these gains. I heard about wringing of hands among businessmen in this country when there was a change of administration in 1960. The hand wringing has changed to hand-clapping as the Kennedy and Johnson administrations have brought this Nation into the 20th century.

As Secretary of Agriculture, I am sure that many of you wonder why I have this interest in business. Food and agriculture is the largest single business enterprise in our Nation. As Secretary of Agriculture, I am concerned with your interests—business interests—with the interests of the farmer, the consumer, the taxpayer, and each and every one of our citizens.

I am gratified that the prosperity of the Nation has extended to the textile industry. Your investment of more than a billion dollars this year in new plants and facilities means that you are doing well and that you are confident enough to make a record investment in the future. Your investment will mean stronger economies in those places where new facilities are built or old facilities are expanded. It will mean new jobs for our workers and it will mean new markets for the cotton grower.

My task, and your task, is to build on the base we have constructed to insure that these trends will continue. Whether we improve or decline from today's level will reflect the decisions we make now and in the days, weeks, and months to come.

This is what I want to discuss with you. Let me first review briefly some of the steps which brought us to where we are today in the textile industry.

Five years ago the Nation's economy had dipped into the third recession in the past decade, and earnings in the textile industry showed little prospect for improvement.

There was a crisis in confidence in the textile economy. The administration set out to dispel it.

We negotiated with other textile producing countries arrangements which assured them of access to U.S. markets; in return, these countries have shown restraint in not flooding domestic markets.

A number of tax policy actions were taken to encourage greater investment by U.S. industry in general, and this has been of particular benefit to the textile industry. A more rapid tax depreciation schedule was instituted in 1961 and 1962, and corporate taxes were reduced in 1964 along with personal income taxes.

While these actions helped to strengthen the financial condition of the textile industry, even more basic changes in cotton production and cotton pricing policies were essential to the long run health of the cotton and textile economy.

The cotton program which had served the Nation well for many years had simply run out of gas. Cotton exports were declining, cotton consumption in domestic mills was losing ground to test tube fibers, and the cotton carryover was increasing rapidly.

New cotton legislation was enacted in 1964. It helped in some ways. It made the breakthrough on one-price cotton but the 1964

cotton program was not a success. You will recall that in 1964 many of us, and I include myself and I know many of you here, claimed that the move to one-price cotton would increase domestic consumption by more than a million bales and bring about a reduction in the cost of cotton goods to the consumer. We were wrong and it became obvious that a new program was needed. With the new legislation the carryover of cotton continued to increase; the annual cost of the cotton program moved toward a billion dollars and it appeared it would continue to rise.

This was the setting in which we considered cotton legislation in 1965.

The legislation we adopted last year sets price support loans at near world prices and should enable cotton to move freely—and without Government participation—in domestic and world markets. A system of direct payments will maintain grower incomes at levels which will enable the farmer to meet his costs and obtain a decent income for himself and his family.

With our price support loan at 21 cents per pound for the 1966 crop, and our export prices at more competitive levels, we can, and should have, larger cotton exports. Although exports during the current season will be low because countries abroad will be reducing their stocks on hand in anticipation of lower U.S. prices for the 1966 crop, we expect exports in the 1966-67 marketing year to increase sharply. Part of this increase will be to replenish the low stocks which will be held abroad on August 1, 1966, and part will be the result of the new program and its effect on production abroad.

We expect the new legislation to slow the rate of increase of world cotton production—but not to cause a decline in cotton production abroad. Lower cotton prices can encourage the consumption of cotton abroad because of more effective competition with rayon.

Slight changes in the rates of growth of cotton consumption and production abroad can cause a rather significant change in cotton exports from the United States. Cotton production abroad (excluding mainland China) totals around 31 million bales and cotton consumption is around 34 million bales. Foreign consumption has been increasing at a rate of about 2.7 percent a year and foreign production about 4.1 percent a year for the past 10 years.

If we could slow the rate of growth in production by just 1 percentage point and increase the rate of consumption by just 1 percentage point, U.S. exports could reach roughly 6 million bales in about 2 years. This is the kind of effort we must be making.

With higher exports and strong participation by producers in the new cotton program, we can bring a substantial reduction in the present record 16 million bale cotton carryover. Production on an annual basis likely will decline about 1.5 to 2 million bales from the recent levels of about 15 million bales.

Another factor which can help increase cotton consumption, and speed the decline in carryover, is an effective cotton promotion program. Congressman HAROLD COOLEY, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, introduced yesterday a bill to establish a self-help research and promotion program for cotton. I believe this kind of activity can benefit the whole industry and consumers and taxpayers alike.

But the rate and extent to which the mountainous surplus of cotton is reduced will depend, as much as anything, on the actions and policies of you in the textile industry. In effect, it is within your power to help determine how successful the new cotton program will be, and whether the American people will accept it as reasonable public policy.

I emphasize this fact, not because it is a startling revelation, but rather to impress

upon you the need for us to continue the spirit of cooperation which has brought the Nation's economy to its present level of efficiency and prosperity.

When the search for an effective cotton program began, the textile industry took the position it would support any program which would achieve one-price cotton. You soon discovered that sound public policy was not that simple. You had to decide what that policy should be, and then to give active and sustained support to that policy as it was being developed in the Congress.

There is no less need today for responsible action on the part of the textile industry.

Since early in 1964, prices paid by domestic mills for cotton have declined about 9 cents a pound. In 1964 the index on broad woven goods and yarns declined as well. It is an interesting fact that, during this same period, imports went down and exports went up.

Then late in 1964 the price on woven goods began to rise—the prices on yarns began to rise. The price for broad woven grey goods, for example, has increased nearly 8 percent during the period from 1964 to date. What has happened? Exports of cotton textiles have declined and imports of cotton textiles have increased.

This is what I am referring to when I suggest that you and everyone in the textile industry needs to give your full consideration and your every thought to action in this vital area of the cost of goods.

While it is true that mill consumption did increase last year by some 200,000 bales over 1964, to a level of 9.2 million bales, declines in exports and a sufficient increase in imports to bring about a 400,000-bale balance in favor of imports indicates that this is a 400,000-bale domestic market the textile industry has turned over to foreign producers.

I am sure we both recognize the value and worth of this new one-price cotton program, and we must make every possible effort to insure that it works for the benefit of all segments of the economy. Our failure would be a smashing blow at the textile industry of this Nation.

That is why I have come here tonight. We are beginning a new phase of the cooperation which has brought us a long way from the dismal outlook of just 5 years ago.

I pledge you to carry forward the spirit of cooperation undiminished, and I am confident that you will do the same.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS ON RHODESIA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it was my recent privilege to visit the newly independent nation of Southern Rhodesia. Next week, I will present a full report on the observations which Ralph DeTolledo, Dr. Max Yergan, and myself have after our visit, along with our recommendations. Specifically, however, I would like to make two of my own recommendations to the House of Representatives.

First, I believe we should authorize a special subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to visit Southern Rhodesia and get a firsthand look at what is going on there. I ask this because it is my belief that we are not getting the whole story or the true story

from our State Department. This request has been forwarded to the able chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Second, I believe this Congress should take a serious look at our State Department policy regarding Rhodesia. We should specifically consider, at minimum, a congressional resolution which would urge the State Department and the administration to withhold any cooperation in the British sanctions and boycott until that nation ceases its shipping into North Vietnam. It is a travesty of justice and offensive to commonsense that we should aid them in their boycott against Rhodesia, a questionable policy in the first place, when they give no reciprocity to our position in South Vietnam where we are fighting a Communist enemy and they are currently the chief free world shipper to North Vietnam.

Africa is in ferment. We failed in Asia because the people—indeed, as the late President Kennedy once pointed out, even the diplomats and the Congress—failed to understand the dimensions of what was taking place, the relative position of the contending forces and our policy therein. To make sure this does not happen in Africa we need the piercing light of public and congressional inquiry not the paper curtain of the State Department with its handed-down press releases and positions. We can do no less.

FREE WORLD SHIPPING TRADES WITH NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, American men are dying in Vietnam to preserve the free world from further encroachment by Communist aggressors.

It is ironic, therefore, that our free world allies persist in permitting their shipping interests to trade with North Vietnam. Although the exact figures are classified, it is a matter of record that in 1965 there were more free world than Communist ships carrying goods to and from North Vietnam.

Regardless of their cargoes—and we have only the assurance of the shipping firms involved that they consist of non-strategic goods in most cases—this amounts to giving aid and comfort to our enemy. This is an economic war as well as a military conflict. If economic pressures can be applied to Ho Chi Minh, they must be, just as they have been to Castro.

I say it is time for the United States to talk the only language these free world foreign-flag shippers apparently understand: serve notice on them that they cease delivering goods of any sort to Hanoi or stand barred from doing any business at all in U.S. ports.

I am today introducing legislation which would prohibit foreign vessels which trade with North Vietnam not only

from carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes but from doing any business at all in our ports. I urge the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to take prompt action on this bill.

SKI WEEK IN THE BERKSHIRES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, thanks to swift action by both the House and Senate last month we have just observed National Ski Week. May I say, as the Representative to this body who enjoys serving perhaps the finest large-scale ski area in the Nation, I welcomed the proclamation and the national observance.

I think it is entirely in keeping with the renewed emphasis in recent years from the National, State, and local governments on outdoor recreation and on wholesome sports activity in which all may participate. It also stresses the encouragement of recreational development of otherwise marginal mountain areas which we in Massachusetts have been doing for some years.

For anyone who skis, I know I need not extol the merits of the Berkshire Mountains in my district. Spotted throughout the Berkshires are the resorts and ski areas of Berkshire Snow Basin, Bousquet's, Brodie Mountain, Burrington Hill, Butternut Basin, Catamount, Chickley Alps, Dutch Hill, Jiminy Peak, Jug End, Otis Ridge, Petersburg Pass, and Thunder Mountain.

I am equally proud of Avaloch, Spring-side Park, Goodell Hollow, Happyland Ski Area, the Thunderbolt Trail on Mount Greylock, Oak N' Spruce, Osceola Playground, Pittsfield State Forest, and Shaker Village on Mount Lebanon.

Also in my district are the ski facilities of Cheshire Ski Area, Eastover, Mount Mohawk, Mount Tom, the Northfield Inn, and the Sawmill Hill Ski Area.

Most of these are as familiar to skiers as the names of Hialeah, Aqueduct, and Churchill Downs are to horse players. These resort areas and ski slopes rank among the best in the world and annually draw thousands to the Berkshires.

I am personally proud to serve the many enterprising and forward-looking men and women who have taken the initiative in developing these fine facilities in anticipation of the present boom in skiing and other winter sports. They are performing an invaluable service to the economic and physical well-being of our State and of the Nation.

Of course, the idea of ski week is nothing new to these ski lodge innovators. For quite some time now, most have been offering a package 5-day ski week for winter vacationers at reduced rates. The response has been most gratifying. Most of these package deals include lodging from Sunday through Thursday nights with skiing from Sunday through Friday. Many include ski lessons, meals, and special entertainment.

Prices start about \$40 on up for the 5-day deal, a bargain in these days of increasing prices and costs. Full details, I might add, are available from the Berkshire Hills Conference in my hometown of Pittsfield, Mass.

The Berkshire Eagle, the largest daily paper published in my district, recently ran their annual ski supplement issue. While I regret that the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are not equipped to reproduce the many fine illustrations which graphically reveal the scenic grandeur and fine facilities awaiting the skier in the Berkshires, I can request consent to include as a part of my remarks one of the articles from this special supplement. I am sure you will agree it captures some of the flavor of excitement and good fun that is an integral part of skiing and for which we designated National Ski Week.

The article follows:

[From the Berkshire Eagle, Dec. 11, 1965]

RESORTING TO SKI

(By Lee Goerlach)

Berkshire resorts have catered to the ski bunny so effectively that winter may supersede summer as the busy season, despite Tanglewood and various other summer attractions.

Realizing that the majority of their guests are tackling the long boards for the first time, the resorts tailor their programs to a beginner's apprehensions.

Guests are pampered, protected, and taught the fundamentals of the sport by instructors chosen for personality and patience.

"We need men who can teach our guests how to put on their skis and walk, and how to do a snowplow, then stop at the bottom of our little hill," owner George Bisacca of Eastover in Lenox, says.

"We keep an eye on them, even to anticipating falls. If our efforts to keep them on their feet fail, we pick them up and serve them soothing hot chocolate right on the hill if they are shaken.

"We get them before they are beginners," Eastover ski director Jeff Roche says. "They become so accustomed to being served that they are apt to walk off the hill, leaving their skis behind them. So we pick up the skis and put them back where they belong. The key word here is attention."

Proving that nothing is too good for his guests, Bisacca installed a 1,500-foot chair lift last year to supplement the little rope tow.

The fact that he didn't have a hill big enough for the chair didn't faze Bisacca. He bought a neighboring hill and moved all 14,000 cubic yards of it truckful by truckful to Eastover.

Swimming, movies, skating, dancing, and various after activities keep the guests happy even if rain washes out the ski hill. "And skiing is so leisurely that we stop at noon for a full-course meal," Bisacca said.

This is the pattern in varying degrees at all four Berkshire winter resorts. With the exception of Avaloch in Lenox, all have snow-making.

At Jug End in South Egremont, skiing seems more serious than at the other resorts. Ski director Dave Scott received his U.S. Amateur Ski Association (USEASA) certification along with Olympic skier Andrea Mead Lawrence last winter.

"I'll put my ski school up against the bigger areas anywhere," he says. But diplomacy and the value of individual attention also are part of the training he gives his staff.

"Focus your smile on the homeliest girl in the class," Dave tells his instructors. "She will be pleased and the rest of the class will

love you for it. If you choose the prettiest girl, everyone will hate you," he warns.

Dave is from northern Ireland and has his full share of Irish wit and charm. "I'm probably the only certified instructor in the world from northern Ireland," he says.

Jug End has a 1,500-foot T-bar and a rope tow. The hill is challenging enough to attract transient skiers. Jug End also conducts a program for children of nearby towns. About 50 youngsters (from 9 to 16 years old) participated in the third year of the program last season.

Oak N' Spruce in South Lee also has a USEASA certified ski director, Rainer Schmidt of Germany, who has taught in famous ski areas all over the world, according to resort owner Frank Prinz.

Oak N' Spruce has the smallest hill and smallest snowmaking operation. "Isn't it ridiculous," Frank says, as he proudly displays the miniature electric compressor. "But it keeps the hill covered. That is what counts."

The South Lee resort has the largest skating rink of the foursome. It floods the tennis courts.

"We offer social skiing, a combination of both daytime ski activities and nighttime pleasures associated with resort life," Prinz says. "Our slopes have been designed for the novice. Our ski school knows how to instruct the beginner. The slopes are not challenging enough for the experts. The expert can find his match at nearby Berkshire ski areas."

Avaloch added a 1,000-foot T-bar to its ski complex this year. The 18-sided Gazebo, which serves as a summer dining room, is flooded for ice skating. Guests are provided most anything they ask for.

"We have a juke box and hi-fi for dancing, but if the crowd wants live music, we'll provide it," Manager Dave Green says.

Owner Michael Bakwin directs the ski program, assisted by Ed Weiss of Lenox. Accommodations are limited to about 100 overnight guests at present. But ground is being broken for an additional 20 units. "We expect the T-bar will increase interest enough to warrant construction of a ski lodge next season," Green says.

Swiss fondues, ski talk around the fire at night, parlor games, ping pong, skating on illuminated rinks—you name it, and the Berkshire resorts have it. (If they haven't got it, they'll get it for you.)

All four resorts have special midweek rates that run about half the cost of week-ends or holidays. All four have rental equipment. Seldom does a beginner have his own skis and boots. When he does, they are apt to be unsuitable.

Dave Scott tells, for example, about the 86-year-old doctor from White Plains, N.Y., who arrived in class with head skis, marker toe piece and turntable heel with longthongs, equipment usually worn by racers or hot shot skiers.

Dave assumed that the doctor was one of the rare species to show up at a resort—the expert. But the doctor had never before been on skis. He had purchased the unsuitable gear from a salesman obviously as unfamiliar with skiing as his customer.

This was New Year's 2 years ago, a bitterly cold day if you remember. The doctor may not have known his ski equipment, but he knew frostbite when he saw it. About halfway through the lesson he said to Dave, "Sonny, your ears are turning white, you'd better go inside."

Eastover attracts mostly single people. The others have everything from singles to families. Some come dressed in the latest style. Others ski in car coats and levis.

"One girl had such an extensive wardrobe that she changed her clothes several times a day," Jug End's Scott remembers.

"By and large we get family groups at Avaloch," Green says. "We still are host to

singles in tour groups in January through March, but have mostly families on holiday weekends. Except for the tours, ours is a family business."

There is very little repeat business from the resort skier. "We get a whole new wave each season," Bisacca says. "Once the ski bug bites them, they go off to ski at the big areas," Prinz agrees. "We are the cradle of the industry."

Guests arrive at the resorts on Friday night for the weekend.

"They dance until midnight, then are up at the crack of dawn waiting in line at the ski shop to be fitted to boots and skis," Prinz says. "They stay up until all hours again Saturday. By Sunday they start to wear out a little. Activity on the ski slopes doesn't start until about 11 a.m. And they start leaving for home by late afternoon."

U.S. POSITION ON VIETNAM

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson went to Honolulu with the overwhelming support of the vast majority of the people of this country. I think the cause of peace can best be served at this juncture by reaffirming that support and making it clear to all the world.

What is the United States trying to accomplish in Vietnam? The answer to that question is quite clear. It is the same answer we have been giving for more than 10 years. We are in Vietnam to reaffirm the right of any people to determine its own destiny in its own way. We are there to prove that force and violence are no longer acceptable ways for any power to impose its will upon its neighbors. The fact that the kind of force and violence being employed in South Vietnam is aggression in a new disguise does not change the nature of what we are trying to do. President Johnson has stated our purpose in Vietnam again and again. He has said:

Our objective is the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom from attack. We want nothing for ourselves—only that the people of South Vietnam be allowed to guide their own country in their own way. We will do everything necessary to reach that objective and we will do only what is absolutely necessary.

I wish it were possible—

And I am still quoting the President—to convince others with words what we now find it necessary to say with guns and planes: armed hostility is futile—our resources are equal to any challenge—because we fight for values and we fight for principles, rather than territory or colonies, our patience and our determination are unending. Once this is clear, then it should also be clear that the only path for reasonable men is the path of peaceful settlement.

President Johnson has said on a score of different occasions that he is prepared to go anywhere, any time, and discuss with any government a peaceful solution for Vietnam—unconditionally. Dozens of world leaders have urged the Com-

munists in Hanoi and Peiping to participate in such discussions. They have refused. They are trying to keep discussions out of the United Nations.

It is obvious that the Chinese Communists and probably the Communists in Hanoi do not want to talk peace. They do not want to talk peace because they still believe that they can achieve a military victory. They believe that we will get tired of the struggle, that the American Government will lose popular support and be compelled to retreat.

They are wrong.

We know they are wrong.

Support for American actions in Vietnam is and always has been widespread among the American people. This can be amply demonstrated by quotations from two great Americans. One is from a letter written by President Eisenhower to Prime Minister Churchill in 1954. Speaking of the situation in southeast Asia, President Eisenhower said:

If I may refer again to history, we failed to halt Hirohito, Mussolini, and Hitler by not acting in unity and in time. That marked the beginning of many years of stark tragedy and desperate peril. May it not be that our nations have learned something from that lesson?

Now here is another quote from that same year of 1954. This was a speech at Harvard University by General Eisenhower's chief political opponent—the late Adlai Stevenson:

It has fallen to America's lot to organize and lead that portion of the world which adheres to the principle of consent in the ordering of human affairs. It is an assignment we undertook not by choice but by necessity and without prior experience. The burden is without historic parallel and so is the danger, and so is our response. The first phase is ending. The outward thrust of aggression in Europe has been arrested. Now we shall have to address ourselves to Asia, to perpetual siege and to the unending tasks of greatness. For the quest for peace and security is not a day's or a decade's work. For us it may be everlasting.

There you have the political consensus in America on the subject of aggression in southeast Asia. We have not changed. Today we have a Democratic President—and he enjoys the same firm support from Republican former President Eisenhower that General Eisenhower received from Mr. Stevenson.

There are some who are honestly and sincerely confused about what is going on in South Vietnam. And there are some others who are more than willing to increase the confusion. But the facts speak for themselves.

What is being attempted in Vietnam is the same cynical totalitarian aggression we have fought for a generation. Only now it is trying out a new strategy. It is now trying to prove that a small group of well-armed and ruthless terrorists can be sent into a country to first subvert its government and then to enslave its people before the world realizes that an invasion has begun.

The whole history of our century proves conclusively that the appetite for aggression is unlimited. There is no known instance of an aggressor leaving his neighbors alone because his appetite was satisfied. If we do not stand by

South Vietnam today, then—as surely as night follows day—we will be called upon to face the challenge somewhere else tomorrow.

President Johnson has chosen to face reality and meet the challenge here and now. He has the firm support of the vast majority of the American people.

A FARCE IN ONE ACT

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, considerable attention has been devoted of late to what might occur in various of our State legislatures following reapportionment on a population-only basis.

Those of us who support the pending reapportionment constitutional amendment affecting State legislative reapportionment believe that the ultimate decision in such a vital area of government must lie with the American people themselves. That is the purpose of the pending resolution regarding reapportionment.

This issue is clear and fundamental.

The point, I believe, is interestingly made in a recent column appearing in the San Francisco Examiner by Jack S. McDowell where an excellent, whimsical commentary on the problem is set forth.

With unanimous consent, I therefore ask that this article be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Nov. 2, 1965]

A FARCE IN ONE ACT

(By Jack S. McDowell)

SACRAMENTO.—The time: 1967 or thereafter. Californians have been saved from themselves by the U.S. Supreme Court. Reapportionment, back in 1965, made all State senate districts about equal in population—but not in geography or economic interests. Some new senators now represent a dozen counties.

Senator Paul Pullet of the first senatorial district answers the phone in his office in Petaluma. Sam Sawtooth, one of his constituents in Crescent City, is calling (at 90 cents for the first 3 minutes).

Mr. SAWTOOTH. Senator, a number of us are having nothing but trouble from the division and we need your help.

Senator PULLET. Always glad to help the people of our district, sir. Why don't you and your associates drop around to my office right after lunch and—

Mr. SAWTOOTH. After lunch. Why, Senator, it's 333 miles from here to Petaluma, not counting detours around the bridge washouts.

Senator PULLET. Yes, you are in the northern neighborhood of the district, aren't you? Well, maybe we can handle it on the phone. Now, you mentioned trouble with the division. Which division of the agriculture department is that, sir? Compliance, or the bureau of poultry inspection?

Mr. SAWTOOTH. Ag, shmagg, Senator. I'm talking about those division of forestry guys.

Senator PULLET. Oh, forestry, huh? Hmmm. Well, what seems to be the problem, Mr. Sawtooth?

Mr. SAWTOOTH. Well, one of those division guys got so noisy shouting the rulebook at two of our scalers that the whistlepunk got so rattled he signaled wrong, somebody hit the winch and we almost laminated one of our best toppers into about 500 board feet of second-growth.

Senator PULLEY. Scalers? Whistlepunk? Topper? Uh, by the way, Mr. Sawtooth, what's the name of your firm?

Mr. SAWTOOTH. The Mountainside Logging Co.

Senator PULLEY. Logging? Oh, yes. I've heard of your company many times. Fine reputation. Well, it sounds as if you do have a problem and I will demand a full report from the director of agri * * * I mean from those forestry people. By the way, Mr. Sawtooth, how did you people up there ever come to plant redwood trees instead of raising chickens or some nice wine grapes?

As the senator hung up, his secretary stopped in.

"Senator Quartzly wants you to call him right away at his office at the Modoc Mining Co., in Alturas," she said. "He wants to know what peach blight and pear decline are, because he just told some of his Stanislaus County constituents he'll introduce a bill to have them repealed."

JUDGE PERRY B. JACKSON

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, between November 1947 and February of 1954, it was my privilege to serve as associate judge of the municipal court of Cleveland, a trial court of general jurisdiction in the city of Cleveland. In the course of this association, it was my privilege to serve with the Honorable Perry B. Jackson who has since become a judge of the court of common pleas of Cuyahoga County.

During my two terms of office on the Cleveland municipal court, I had the opportunity to frequently counsel with Judge Jackson and very often relied on his wise experience in trial procedure and legal research.

On Thursday, January 27, Judge Jackson celebrated his 70th birthday. His life story is a story of perseverance and integrity. Mr. James T. Cox, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, paid proper tribute to this eminent jurist on Sunday, January 23. Mr. Cox's article follows:

JUDGE JACKSON TURNING 70—RACIAL EMPHASIS ERASED

(By James T. Cox)

Judge Perry B. Jackson considers as one of his lesser achievements his indirect responsibility for tradition-bound newspaper writing in Cleveland.

For many years after 1942, when he was appointed a Cleveland municipal judge by Gov. John W. Bricker, a typical newspaper story about him would start like this: "Judge Perry B. Jackson, the first Negro to serve as a judge in Ohio."

Times changed, as do social attitudes. A Negro on the bench is commonplace today. And news writing concentrates more on the person, not the race.

Judge Perry Brooks Jackson, now on the common pleas court bench, will celebrate his 70th birthday Thursday. He will be in court that day, presiding at a murder trial.

He wants only one birthday gift: an abundance of energy to preside at trials for many more years.

At 70, every man is entitled to philosophize a little. Sitting in his court chambers last week at the close of a trial day, a desk lamp reflecting on his ever-present Phi Beta Kappa key, Judge Jackson did just that.

"Oh, I guess I have much to be thankful for," he said, "and I thank Almighty God for giving me talents, the energies and the desire for public service. For giving me the finest parents a man could want, and the most devoted wife in the world."

Throughout his life, one of his talents has been for hard work. To earn his college and law school tuition, he worked at a variety of jobs—bus boy, waiter, steel mill employee.

"Those were the days, though, when it was literally possible to work one's way through college. The tuition today makes that ideal prohibitive," the judge said.

"Of course, the money was not as good in the old days. The summers I worked in a steel mill I worked 60 hours a week, for \$9.60—a week. The next summer I got a rise—to 18 cents an hour, or \$10.80 a week."

As a young man with a fresh law degree in 1922, Judge Jackson tried to prove to a law school dean that a large law firm would hire a Negro.

"After about a month of job hunting, I had less than a dollar in my pocket. An uncle gave me an old desk and chair, and I started my own practice in the anteroom of another Negro lawyer's office. The dean had been correct."

In 1942, Judge Jackson said, the time was at last politically "right" for a Negro judge.

"The feeling in Columbus, however, was that because four Negroes had been previously defeated for municipal judge, it might be best to appoint a Negro to the bench, to 'prove' to the community that a Negro was capable of doing the job, so to speak."

"To be quite honest, however," the judge said, "the idea of 'the first Negro' is more often annoying than amusing. One has hardly heard of the first Italian, or the first Jew, to hold an office. Only the Negro. You only have to study the mayoral race here last November."

This "first" concept does have rewards, however, he admits.

"As a judge, and as a representative of the Negro community, I was asked to serve on many civic committees. Too many, in fact, so I was able to recommend other Negroes. You'd be surprised how quickly the white community discovers the large number of qualified people in a minority group that can do an equally good job."

The youth who came from Zanesville carrying a cardboard suitcase containing a meager supply of clothes and a few celluloid collars, was elected to three terms in municipal court and elected twice to the common pleas court bench. He will be running again this November.

The signal honor in his life was receiving an honorary doctor of laws degree from Western Reserve University, in 1961.

"I believe," he says, "that an honorary degree given by one's college is the finest award a man can receive in his lifetime. That is how I feel about mine."

He did not say so, but Judge Jackson was the first Negro awarded an honorary degree by WRU.

PIGGYBACK RAILROADING

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more interesting to observe than a new idea that grows to be a success, bringing more efficient services to the public as well as profit to those who carry out the idea.

Right after World War II, a new idea was called "Piggyback Railroad." It was a proposal that the railroad and trucking industries cooperate to their mutual benefit by the transport on the railroads of loaded trailer vans over long distances. Upon arrival at the destination, tractors would be ready to pull the trailers away to distribute the goods at various warehouses. Piggyback railroading caught on and today comprises a large part of railroad business.

Now we observe the development of another piggyback program—called piggyback marketing by the Department of Commerce, although a more accurate name would probably be cooperative exporting.

The concept is easy to understand. It refers to a situation in which the products of smaller companies ride the back and shoulders of larger, big-name companies into world markets that would otherwise be difficult or impossible to reach. The Department of Commerce acts as a middleman or clearinghouse in order to bring prospective carriers and riders together.

Just as examples, a large flour milling company exports the jams and jellies of a small businessman; and a big steel corporation markets the metal doors and frames made by a small company.

When agreements between companies are worked out, the result is new opportunities for sales and profits for businessmen, in that it permits exporting by small companies whose marketing organizations are not geared to overseas trade. It enables the big companies to broaden the product lines which they can offer overseas and to bolster their export sales.

Though the mechanics of a piggyback operation are fairly basic, the arrangements vary from company to company. The most common arrangement is simply one in which the big company buys the products of the small company outright at the best price it can get, and sells on its own terms. Other arrangements are those in which the big company buys the smaller company's product at discount or it may sell for a commission.

The carrier companies also vary in deciding what products they will market. All companies want products they can market at a profit, but in addition, some companies will market only those products which are related to their own. The piggyback process is not necessarily limited to products that round out a marketing package, however. It can involve a variety of goods whether related or unrelated.

The clearinghouse services of the Government include communicating with companies established overseas to determine if they are interested in selling a product. Then when a rider company

applies for carrier service, the Government supplies it with the names of three interested carriers and helps the rider and carrier firms arrange negotiations. To expand the efficiency and scope of the program the Department of Commerce is now setting up an automatic data processing system which will enable it to pinpoint which U.S. companies might piggyback for which rider companies. It is anticipated that the computerized system will be ready by late spring, at which time the information will be available to any American manufacturer interested in the program. The eventual agreements regarding terms and cost are privately negotiated by the companies involved, with no government participation.

All in all, piggybacking or cooperative exporting seems to have a very bright future. A firm interested in the idea either as an exporter or as one which would like to export need only contact the Assistant Director, Bureau of International Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. The local Commerce Department field office will also furnish information regarding this program.

Through piggybacking, thousands of companies whose business is now confined to the domestic market could grow and become exporters. This would be good for them and good for the country.

A SERVICE CORPS FOR OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I join many of my colleagues in seeking to establish a National Senior Community Service Corps. Today, I introduced a bill identical to the one offered by them, that would provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps.

The Senior Corps would be established within the Administration on Aging of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and would be charged with channelling the abilities and energies of our citizens, past 60, to projects of benefit both to the elderly, to their neighbors and to our communities. Sponsors would submit programs to State agencies, now responsible for formulating plans for the elderly, for approval of the Administration on Aging. This would make Senior Corps programs a major part of State plans.

The new program would give national impetus, technical assistance and funds to programs of benefit to our elderly, their neighbors and our communities. Our older citizens represent a potent reservoir of experience, wisdom and skills that we should not allow to dry up unused. To appreciate the wealth of human values stocked in this reservoir, we have but to consider that in 1960 there

were 4.6 million persons 60 years of age and over in the labor force, many of whom are now retired or about to retire. Among them were 126,000 public school teachers, 35,000 lawyers, 18,000 college faculty members, 11,000 librarians, 32,000 physicians and surgeons and 43,000 professional nurses, to mention only a few categories.

Many of these people are vigorous, enjoy good health and wish to continue actively in the lifestream of their communities. These are people who can never be happy on the shelf no matter how comfortable it may be. In our expanding economy many of the skills possessed by these people can be put to good use. We should not shut the door on these people and exclude them from participation in the life of our communities.

I suggest that a new alternative be given to these people and that alternative is embodied in the senior service concept.

America with its prodigious production capacity tends to accelerate obsolescence to the point where much of its goods are relegated to the scrap heap long before they have outlived their usefulness. We must not allow that thinking to carry over to our human material. Such values as wisdom and understanding are slow to nurture and are found mostly in people who have lived full and useful lives. They are too precious to be lightly discarded.

What is it that these people would do under my bill. Briefly, they would serve the great social needs of our communities. Two new programs sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity come to mind. Under their foster grandparent program men and women past 55 years are giving care and attention to very young children in hospitals. All concerned are delighted with the new mood in the children's wards. Operation Medicare Alert enlists older Americans to notify isolated elderly citizens about their social security benefits before the March 31 expiration date.

This Nation should awaken to the present waste of the energies and abilities of our older Americans and should determine to stop this waste and to put it to effective use. The number of elderly American citizens is expected to increase in the years to come. Today we have 19 million people past 65, in 20 years their number will probably rise to 25 million, an increase of 6 million.

What we as a nation do with the energy, experience, and imagination of these people could affect our course and history. This bill is an attempt to provide a partial answer.

JACK HOOD VAUGHN OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the time allotted me to pay tribute to a fellow Montanan, Jack Hood Vaughn, who recently has been named Director of the Peace Corps.

Jack Vaughn has combined unusual ability with great dedication in a long-term effort to make a contribution in the foreign affairs field. In 1961, Jack came to Washington to organize the Latin American programs of the Peace Corps. Under his direction, a program of 123 volunteers grew in 3 years to 3,000. In 1964 he was sent to Panama to serve with distinction as our Ambassador there in the difficult period following the Canal crisis.

A year later Jack was called again to Washington to serve as U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress and Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs. In this job, he has made important contributions toward continuing and strengthening our efforts to assist Latin America to build institutions which can reach down to help all the people of the hemisphere. He has also distinguished himself as a brilliant envoy. He speaks fluent Spanish, acquired in his early days when he lived and studied in Mexico and even for a while he was a professional boxer. In addition, he has a very special understanding of the Latin spirit, and a great ability in that always difficult task of communication between peoples. On a recent tour of the hemisphere, cheering crowds carried him on their shoulders.

Now Jack Vaughn moves on to devote his energy and his interest in people to the Peace Corps which he helped start. His achievement stands as an example of what a dedicated man can do, and I am sure we will all benefit from the service he will render in his new assignment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a news item accounting his service to his job and country be printed.

THE PEACE CORPS—YANKEE, DON'T GO HOME

"Sargent Shriver," said Washington wags last week, "is only a corporal now." Shriver had not exactly been demoted, since he had been pleading for 6 months to be relieved of one of his two jobs. Finally, Lyndon Johnson decided that Shriver, who had been Director of the Peace Corps since its inception in 1961, should now devote full time to the 16-month-old Office of Economic Opportunity, which he has also headed from the start.

After assigning Shriver to the war on poverty, the Great Society program nearest his own heart, Johnson named as Peace Corps Director Jack Hood Vaughn, 45, former U.S. Ambassador to Panama and, since March 1965, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Before his ambassadorial assignment, Vaughn had directed the Peace Corps' Latin American program and will now, as Johnson said it, "return to his first love."

HAD 149 VICTORIES

A slight (5 ft. 8 in., 150 lbs.), combative redhead, Vaughn was reared in Michigan, where he spent so much of his youth boxing that he did not graduate from high school until he was 20. He won the Michigan Golden Gloves as a 124-lb. featherweight, logged 149 victories in 172 amateur and professional fights—and was never knocked out (though his nose was broken three times, his jaw once).

After graduating from the University of Michigan, Vaughn enlisted in the Marine

Corps, was twice wounded on Okinawa, and was eventually discharged as a captain. He earned his master's degree at the University of Michigan in 1947, then spent 10 years in Bolivia, Costa Rica, and Panama as a U.S. Information Service officer and coordinator of U.S. aid projects. In 1961, Shriver grabbed him. Says Vaughn: "The Peace Corps idea had great appeal to me, and the people I knew who were putting this idea into effect appealed to me even more."

BEEKEEPERS AND FISH HATCHERS

Vaughn takes over the Peace Corps as it approaches its fifth birthday. Since its first year, when there were 526 volunteers in 13 countries, the Corps has grown apace, now has 10,380 volunteers at work in 46 countries from Afghanistan to Venezuela. Its annual appropriation has risen from \$30 million to this year's \$114.1 million. Fifty percent of the Corpsmen are teachers, the rest are involved in rural and urban-community development, health projects, agriculture, and public works.

Nonteaching volunteers wind up as beekeepers in Cameroon, accountants in Afghanistan, architects in Tunisia, fish hatchers in Togo. Two dozen men and women volunteers live in some of the world's most scabrous slums, the hillside favelas outside Rio de Janeiro, where they run medical clinics, teach and do social work. This month, when torrential rains and landslides claimed some 200 favelados' lives in Rio, the Corpsmen helped evacuate stricken families, set up emergency health stations, staffed mass vaccination centers.

FEATHER IN THE CAP

The Peace Corps today recruits 85 percent of all volunteers directly from college—and because U.S. campuses have become hotbeds of social protest, finds itself looking for a new kind of volunteer. "We don't want beatniks," says Deputy Director Warren Wiggins, "but we have nothing against beards." The "quiet activists" that Wiggins seeks "don't carry placards. They do things like tutoring Negro school kids. They work without fanfare." In Wiggins' view, the best volunteer has "a basic service motivation, a certain flexibility, a lack of racial prejudice, a certain degree of adventurousness, a sense of idealism."

Plainly, with Shriver's departure the first handcrafted era of the Peace Corps is ended. Under his guidance, says Wiggins, "we have transitioned from a feather in the cap of America to a large-scale operation of sufficient human resources to be of consequence in the changing nations." Now, adds Vaughn, "its character is established. My job is to help it continue to do well." But Vaughn's task may prove tougher than it looks.

INNATE ALTRUISM

Like any other 5-year-old, the Peace Corps is experiencing growing pains. It suffers from sibling rivalry with VISTA, the domestic poverty corps directed by Shriver. Despite intensive recruiting on 1,500 U.S. campuses, an advertising campaign mounted at cost (and sometime too cutely) by a major agency, a whopping 42,068 applicants—not to mention the added inducement of a 2-year deferment for draft-age men—the corps in 1965 fell nearly 1,000 short of its 9,500 volunteer goal. One reason is that today's college student tends increasingly to postpone any job commitment and is often able to discover foreign lands on his own.

The truth is that joining the Peace Corps no longer has quite the glamor it once had—or seemed to have. As Samuel Babbitt, a former Peace Corps staffer and now assistant dean of the Yale Graduate School, points out, the Corps no longer holds for potential volunteers the "tremendous emotional response keyed off by the hero worship of President Kennedy."

Nonetheless, the Peace Corps still appeals to the innate altruism of American youth, and virtually every country to which volunteers have been assigned has welcomed them, asked for more, and often given singular sendoffs to homebound corpsmen who have completed their tours of duty. In a remote settlement in southern India recently, a young corpsman announced that he would soon be returning to the United States to get married. Distraught villagers tried to induce him to stay by offering him anything he might want—including his pick of the local maidens.

THE PLIGHT OF MISSISSIPPI NEGROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEOGH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, 2½ hours were spent yesterday in debate on the subject of Mississippi Negroes who are now living in the delta counties. Basically I pointed out that these Negroes were hungry, in some cases homeless, and that the State of Mississippi, rather than helping, was doing everything in its power to block Federal efforts to distribute food in Mississippi.

Instead of responding to the problem, the Mississippi delegation spent their time trying to lay down a smokescreen, complete with all the tired old red herrings and diversions of Communists, agitators, Federal intervention, and so forth. They questioned my political motives, my political beliefs, my judgment, and experience. But they were not content with just attacking me by reading various derogatory newspaper columns. They had to go on to attack the National Council of Churches and its delta ministry, calling it a leftwing organization, accusing it of supporting revolutionaries, and trying to discredit this outstanding organization, whose only crime that I can see is trying to help those unfortunate Negroes who have been left virtually friendless in eight delta counties. I am happy to enter into the RECORD at this time, this statement from the Right Reverend Paul Moore, Jr., chairman of the commission on the delta ministry:

The delta ministry is an integral part of the National Council of the Churches of Christ, set up by a resolution of its general assembly. The clergy on the staff are all clergy in good standing in their own denominations, and are vouched for by their ecclesiastical authorities. The stance of the delta ministry has to do with our identification with the poor people there and our concern for their desperate needs. These needs are increasingly urgent. They have not been dealt with by the local or Federal Government. Thus, the people are trying in any way they can to call attention to their plight. I hope and trust that the local and Federal governments will respond.

The whole proceeding yesterday reminded me of the story of the dean of the law school who was instructing a new graduate. He said: "Remember, when you do not have the law, quote the facts; when you do not have the facts, quote the law; and when you have neither, just holler." And this is exactly what the gentlemen from Mississippi did yesterday. They just hollered.

They also seemed to have developed a new disease—TV phobia.

Several times during the debate, they expressed what can only be interpreted as fear of having the TV cameras turned on Mississippi. They seemed to be deathly afraid of what the TV camera and other news media might reveal about conditions in that State.

I would like to point out to these gentlemen that from the beginning of time people who have had something to hide—and who are somehow trying to cover up their actions—are the people who have avoided public exposure.

I have nothing to fear. I have nothing to hide, and neither do the Negroes of Mississippi. So we welcome public discussion. We welcome the TV cameras. We welcome the newspaper reporters.

During the course of the debate I offered to go to Greenville with these gentlemen. My offer was ignored. I also offered to arrange a conference here in Washington with the people who have the facts—Sargent Shriver of the Office of Economic Opportunity and Under Secretary Schnitzler of the Department of Agriculture. Again, I was ignored.

I suggest respectfully to the Mississippi delegation that they should join with me in sponsoring a House resolution calling for a special or select committee made up of Members of this distinguished body to investigate the situation in Mississippi.

After all, this is what we are here for—to learn the facts and to get the truth. Now, if I am wrong, I will be very happy to stand corrected either in Greenville, Miss., or in the offices of the administration downtown, or here on the floor of the House. If I have the wrong information, I would like to know about it. They have not refuted any of my allegations. They have not refuted my statement that the Negroes are hungry in Mississippi, but instead they tried to divert our attentions by telling us about riots in Harlem and riots in Rochester and racial violence in all sorts of places.

I recall what my grandmother said, and I thought she was a wise old woman. She said that "2 wrongs never make a right; and 5 wrongs do not make a right, and 1,000 wrongs do not make a right." No matter how many stories we hear about racial violence and wrongs in Watts and in Rochester or in Detroit, this does not detract from the fact that there are people in Mississippi that are being denied food because they are Negroes.

The distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, told a very touching story about a Negro friend of his who would not eat certain surplus commodities and brought them to the Congressman's home. One of the items that the distinguished gentleman mentioned that his good friend brought him was cheese. I tell you, Members of this House, that the only part of the cheese that Mr. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS' friend got from Department of Agriculture surplus commodities was the holes from swiss cheese. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has not, for the past couple of years, had any cheese to distribute as surplus. Mississippi Congressmen then

turned their fire on Federal intervention. During the debate yesterday I tried to put in some figures which I thought were very cogent and interesting, because there is one type of Federal intervention that the Mississippi delegation does like. As a matter of fact, they like it so much that they have been known from time to time to request more. This is Federal intervention in the Mississippi State treasury. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] took out his part of this debate, as is his privilege, but it is also my privilege to put it back in.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. RESNICK. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not do that. The only part of the debate, the only thing I took out, was the colloquy about your middle initial. That is the only thing I took out of the debate.

Mr. RESNICK. I believe the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], at the time I arrived in the Chamber, was talking about Federal intervention in the State of Mississippi, and that was not in the RECORD as I read it today. If I am proven wrong, I will apologize to him.

During the debate I did my best to point out that according to the figures that I read in a Mississippi paper—and again I stand corrected if I am wrong—in the next 2 years the budget of the State of Mississippi will have \$350 million raised by local taxes. I would like to point out, also, that the vast majority of these taxes will be raised by a 4½ percent sales tax. I would also like to point out that this 4½ percent sales tax is on food as well as every other item. Mississippi is one of the few States in the Nation that taxes the food people eat. I would also like to point out that a very small part of this money is raised by personal or property taxes.

The U.S. Government in its policy of Federal intervention in the State of Mississippi will make a direct contribution of \$280 million for the next 2 years. This is direct contribution. It does not count any other moneys going into the States, such as OEO programs and so on.

Now, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture figures, in fiscal 1966—and this is just 1 year—\$304,540,000 will go to Mississippi in Federal farm payments. This kind of intervention is fine. But when I, as a Member of this House who has to vote on these appropriations, say something is wrong down there, this is Federal intervention of the wrong kind. You cannot have it both ways. Either Mississippi wishes to be part of the federal system or not.

The question was asked by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], Where do I get my facts on the starving Negroes and whites of Mississippi? I would like to quote Mrs. Evelyn Gandy, the State welfare commissioner of the State of Mississippi. This is a quote from the Delta Democratic Times:

Five hundred thousand people in the State of Mississippi, both white and Negro, would benefit from food distribution.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a statement by any leftwinger. This is not a state-

ment by any Communist agitator. This is not a statement by a Congressman who is supposed to have ulterior political motives. This is from the State welfare commissioner of Mississippi. And she ought to know.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to castigate the State of Mississippi. I am here simply to try to get justice for people who are crying out for justice, for people who are crying out for the most basic of all things: food. I once again ask the distinguished delegation from the State of Mississippi to join with me and see that this food gets to those who need it. If the food is not needed, I am sure that it will be turned back.

Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy if we could discuss this problem, honestly and privately, in Mississippi, or in Washington, or anywhere else that the distinguished gentlemen from the State of Mississippi would like to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling out to America not to be indifferent to this terrible problem.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of an old saying: "I am not worried about my enemies, for they can only kill me. I am not worried about my friends because they can only betray me. But I am concerned about the indifferent, for it is the indifferent that will permit my enemies to murder me and my friends to betray me."

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to the American people and to the Members of this House, let us not be indifferent to these calls for help.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RESNICK. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as I did during yesterday's debate I commend the gentleman from New York for having so forcefully brought to the attention of the House the conditions which exist in Mississippi. Congress and the American people must be awakened to these conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is especially appropriate today, as this is a most historic day for the House of Representatives. This is the second anniversary of the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Two years ago, on the 10th day of February 1964, when the distinguished gentleman, who now presides over the House, was then presiding as chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, the debate came to a conclusion. By a vote of 290 to 130 the House of Representatives passed that historic bill.

Mr. Speaker, that vote represented the culmination of years of effort on the part of those of us who were determined that the House recognize its responsibilities in the field of civil rights. Nevertheless, that bill did not deal with other questions which remained unanswered, such as the disenfranchisement of Negroes in the South. In the following year we passed the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Again, this year, the House of Representatives must pass effective legislation to deal with violence and murder di-

rected at those who are exercising their constitutional rights or assisting others to do so. And southern justice must be rendered colorblind. Legislation must be enacted to eliminate discrimination in the selection of juries in the South.

Mr. Speaker, there are many, many things yet to be done to achieve full equality for all Americans. But I believe today we should recall the historic step which was taken in this body 2 years ago and commend all Members of the House who voted for that most forward step in civil rights.

Mr. RESNICK. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that in the course of the debate yesterday the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] wanted the figures as to what the State of New York received and how the State of New York fared in this Federal situation.

New York State, this coming year, will have a budget of \$3.98 billion. We raise this money ourselves. In addition, we will receive only \$800 million in direct Federal aid.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that this represents a far cry, percentagewise, from what the State of Mississippi receives in Federal funds.

I would also like to point out that the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] stated that the city of Greenville has the biggest heart of any city in the South, and if for 1 minute the Negroes were really starving and homeless, the city of Greenville would have made accommodations available to them in a minute.

Mr. Speaker, from all I can see, this is one of the longest minutes in the history of creation, because over 100 homeless Negroes, who were evicted from farms, and who have no source of income whatsoever, have been living in tents right outside the city of Greenville since last October.

Mr. Speaker, the good people of the city of Greenville must be pretty myopic if they could not see this right under their noses.

I should also like to state that another gentleman from Mississippi, Hon. PRENTISS WALKER, pointed out that a good many Negroes in Harlem and other places in the North are anxious to go back to the South because the South took such good care of them.

Let it be noted here and now that the South has taken such good care of its Negro citizens, that 650,000 of them have fled the South in the last 5 years alone. This figure is provided by the U.S. Census Bureau. This is, of course, what I believe to be the policy of the State of Mississippi. They wish that the Negroes today in the State of Mississippi and especially those in the delta counties who have become obsolete—there is no more need for them in the fields—to leave the State. They do not want them voting in the elections.

I would like to conclude by saying—justice must be done for the hungry and homeless. I invite all my colleagues, particularly those from Mississippi to join me in a supreme effort to help the needy in this time of emergency.

KOSCIUSKO DAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1966

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEOGH). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as we honor our great American hero, Abraham Lincoln, this Saturday, it is a great coincidence that we also join on that day with Americans of Polish descent to pay honor to the memory of a celebrated hero of our American Revolution and of Poland's fight against oppressors. Today the loyal Polish-American citizens commemorate the 220th anniversary of the birth of Tadeusz Kosciuszko, that great Polish soldier and patriot who gave so freely of his military genius to help George Washington develop our raw and untrained army into a telling military force.

From his earliest years, Kosciuszko demonstrated a passion for independence along with unusual talents of leadership. Bereft of his beloved father at the age of 13, the boy prepared for admission and obtained a scholarship to the famous military academy in Mezières, France. His record here was so impressive he was graduated with the rank of captain of engineering and artillery.

In the year 1776, while in Paris, Kosciuszko heard much of the struggle of the American colonists for independence. He became so passionately concerned with this struggle for liberty, that he borrowed money to sail to America. Immediately after disembarking at Philadelphia in August, he applied and was accepted for military service with the American forces.

As a result of the outstanding plans which he drew for the fortification of the Delaware River, Kosciuszko was commissioned a colonel of engineers in the Continental Army and subsequently to the Northern Army where he accomplished a magnificent fortification of West Point.

Later he was to see action in the battle of Charleston, S.C., where he again distinguished himself with both courage and valor as well as superior military ability.

In October of 1783 he was promoted to brigadier general and prepared to devote himself to the military needs of this new Nation. However, his concern for his own people and their struggle for a measure of independence caused him to return to his homeland. In Poland he was made a major general and led the Polish patriots in a bitter but hopeless fight.

Overwhelmed by the military and manpower of the enemy, Kosciuszko fell wounded on the historic battlefield of Maciejowice. He was imprisoned in Russia. Later this brilliant military strategist and planner died of a broken heart while living in exile in Switzerland.

In spite of General Kosciuszko's failures and disappointments in his later life, Americans can never forget what he did to bolster our military defenses when our own Continental Army was so close

to starvation and defeat. The young Polish officer's enthusiasm, his impressive military training, and his brilliant mind gave our officers and men a much needed lift in their morale which in turn helped greatly to turn the tide of one defeat after another into a succession of victories.

Mr. Speaker, I commend our great Polish-American organizations and all our citizens of Polish origin for keeping alive the memory of Tadeusz Kosciuszko so that all Americans can be reminded of the contribution of this great patriot.

By remembering Kosciuszko's magnificent deeds and the accomplishments of the other great Poles who so valiantly helped this Nation to gain its independence, we find ourselves drawn closer to all our fellow Americans who so rightfully glory in their Polish heritage. It is with great pride and in the spirit of true brotherhood that we join them in saluting and lauding the memorable deeds of such an American and Polish patriot as Tadeusz Kosciuszko.

MILK FOR SCHOOLCHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today the President has sent to the Congress his message on food for freedom. It is a challenging message in which the President said, and I quote him:

I propose that the United States lead the world in a war against hunger.

I applaud the President's purpose to make our agricultural abundance available to fight hunger and starvation in the developing world.

At the time of this bold approach abroad, it is anomalous and disappointing that at home the administration intends to cut back on both the school lunch program and the special milk program.

Through the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Government has subsidized a school lunch program since 1949 and a program of milk to school youngsters since 1955.

According to the budget submitted for the fiscal year 1967, which the President sent to the Congress on January 24, the special milk program appropriation will be cut from the current \$100 to \$21 million. The school lunch program will be trimmed from the \$202 million figure for the fiscal year 1966 to \$183 million for the fiscal year 1967.

Now the Department of Agriculture states that in the case of the special milk program, that is the program under which children buy milk during the recess period as distinguished from the milk that they get under the school lunch program itself, the cutback is an attempt to "reorient and redirect" the program so that only the needy children will get free milk while other children "pay as they drink."

The Department contends that under the program contemplated, needy children will be better taken care of.

This desire to do more for needy children is commendable, but it seems to me

that this kind of distinction should not be drawn.

For the amount of money spent on either the special milk program or the school lunch program, we ought to continue to pursue a nondiscriminatory policy that provides milk and lunches to all children. Making a distinction between needy children who are eligible for free milk and those children who have to pay for their milk creates the obvious risk of stigmatizing those children who are not able to pay.

There will be needy youngsters and nonneedy youngsters attending the same schools. This is false economy. We gain so little and yet would cause irreparable harm to many youngsters.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore the imposition of a means test on these programs. These programs are admirable. They have been most effective since their inception. I see no compelling reason why the programs should be cut back. If we are not doing enough for needy children now, then we should provide more money for the special milk program and not take milk from other children.

Mr. Speaker, the impact of the war in Vietnam should not deprive American schoolchildren of milk and lunches.

A national economy, which the administration says can support both guns and butter, certainly can support both missiles and milk.

LEGISLATION TO CORRECT INEQUITIES IN THE LAW GOVERNING COOPERATIVE HOUSING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation which is clearly needed to correct inequities in the law governing cooperative housing. In 1961, I introduced a bill to authorize a reduction in premium rates for management-type cooperatives, and this measure was enacted. Last year, I sponsored legislation to provide mutuality for cooperative housing, and this was incorporated in the Housing and Urban Development Act. Yet, the premiums have never been reduced, and the new mutual fund has not been fully put into effect.

The legislation I have introduced today will make the premium reduction mandatory, and will settle the confusion and hesitation which exists in some quarters with respect to the mutuality program, thus paving the way for its effective and expeditious implementation. If ever there has been good mortgage experience, it has been with cooperative housing owners. They have contributed over \$18 million to the FHA housing fund with losses amounting to less than \$34,000. They deserve a break; their superlative record justifies meaningful relief.

Since the inception of their mortgage experience in 1950, owners of management-type co-ops have demonstrated their ability and determination to meet their mortgage commitments. Over the years, they have been paying the standard premium rate for FHA mortgage insurance—one-half of 1 percent—and

have thus contributed over \$18 million. The ratio of premiums to losses is an amazing 568 to 1. Ordinarily, of course, good insurance experience brings about direct reduction in premiums, so 5 years ago, we authorized the FHA to reduce this premium to one-fourth of 1 percent. In August of 1964, Congressman Rains, then chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, stated that it was the expectation of the Senate-House conferees on the housing bill of 1964, that this authority would be exercised before the next housing bill was considered. Well, this time has come and gone, Mr. Speaker, and the authority has never been exercised; the premium still stands at one-half of 1 percent. I am tired of waiting for this discretionary authority to be exercised. I have, therefore, introduced a bill to require the reduction of the premium rate charged to management-type cooperatives to one-fourth of 1 percent. This fund is sound beyond doubt, and the annual savings to these families of upwards of \$30, is clearly warranted.

Because of the superb record which the owners of co-ops have established, the Congress, last year, established a separate mutual fund for the cooperatives. It was our intention at that time—and I am speaking as one of the sponsors of this legislation—to create a special management fund for all management-type cooperatives, so that their premium payments, administrative costs and any losses, would be segregated from the general fund. We provided that when this management fund was sufficiently strong, the FHA would distribute shares or rebates to the co-op owners whose premiums had provided this strength. In fairness, we also stipulated that no such disbursements may be paid out until any funds which might be transferred to the management fund from the general fund, had been reimbursed.

Since that time, the question arose as to whether this reimbursement requirement applied to initial transfers to the management fund, or only to any loans which might be made to that fund by the general fund. The obvious answer is that it applies only to subsequent loans, and the FHA apparently understands this to be the case. However, lest there be any possibility of misconstruing congressional intent on this point, I introduced a bill today to make this absolutely clear. In addition, the bill provides that the Commissioner of the FHA will transfer to the new management fund, an amount equal to the premiums already paid by the co-ops which will come under that fund, minus the administrative expenses theretofore incurred. In this way, the management fund will reflect the full strength of the co-op program, right from the start.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the legislation I have drafted is designed to overcome a key obstacle to the implementation of the mutuality provision we enacted last year. At that time, we amended section 213(m) of the National Housing Act to authorize the transfer of funds from the general insurance fund to the management fund, and we provided that before

this transfer could be effected, the mortgagee or lender would have to consent to the transfer. There is no legal basis for requiring this consent, for it was not required in the case of other funds which were consolidated into the general fund. In any event, mortgagees have disapproved the transfer of at least 69 cooperative funds, thus thwarting the primary aim of those of us who fought for mutuality. Their disapproval of these transfers is based upon a restriction on the use of FHA debentures, which appears to me to have been a result unintended by the drafters of that provision. I therefore introduced perfecting legislation to remove this restriction. With the restriction removed, the requirement of consent is no longer appropriate and accordingly is also removed. Thus, all accounts of management-type cooperatives will be transferred into the management fund, which we established for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the sole objective of the legislation I have introduced today is to provide equitable treatment for owners of management-type cooperatives. Where a class of property holders has demonstrated over the year its determination and ability to meet its obligations, they should not be called upon to bear the brunt of the defaults of other classes of property holders less heedful of their responsibilities. Outstanding performance must be recognized and rewarded. This has been my steady purpose over the past years, and this is my purpose today. I shall exert every effort to secure the early enactment of this necessary legislation, and I invite all my colleagues to join me in this endeavor.

COLD WAR GI BILL OF RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted with the Senate acceptance of the so-called cold war GI bill of rights. This is a testament to the hard work and dedication of two men: OLIN TEAGUE, the able and beloved chairman of our Veterans' Affairs Committee, and Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, the respected and learned gentleman who chairs the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs in the other body.

Chairman TEAGUE, the author of the Korean war GI bill, initiated both the interest and the legislative action on this issue 8 years ago, and I think he is truly deserving of our heartiest compliments. I know how gratified he must be to see his long years of work come to fruition, and I commend him for his steady and inspiring leadership. It has been a privilege to serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee under his wise and skilled leadership.

Senator YARBOROUGH has labored long and hard for this noble objective. His leadership in the other body, and the public support he inspired, was vital to the realization of this goal. It was a privilege to witness the Senator's testimony before our committee last August. It was a remarkable presentation and

clarified many aspects of this subject, contributing greatly to its success.

I think that the veterans of this country, and we in the Congress, can count ourselves fortunate that we have leaders of the caliber of these two gentlemen from the Lone Star State of Texas. For without their high purpose and tenacious perseverance, this historic legislative achievement would not have been possible.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FILING OF REPORTS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have until midnight Saturday to file reports on several bills, including H.R. 12264, 12265, 10431, 10674, 1784, and H.J. Res. 343.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE WORK OF THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN VIETNAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, to our ornithological galaxy about Vietnam—the hawks and the doves—we now add the cuckoos.

Since Columnist Walter Lippmann is the creator of this aviary, I suggest he identify the new species by reading that lulu, the Declaration of Honolulu.

In this, without consultation with them, the American taxpayer and public pledge themselves to "the work of social revolution" in Vietnam and "to the attack on hunger, ignorance and disease" there.

These aims are laudable. I only wish we could carry them out at home. I was, however, apparently under a grand delusion: I thought we were fighting with arms to defeat Communist armed intervention in South Vietnam.

With due respect to all concerned, I can only say that this compulsion by the administration to support the whole world is a real bird.

BUTTER AS WELL AS GUNS TO THE VIETNAMESE FIGHTING THE COMMUNIST INVADERS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Declaration of Honolulu is a true lulu.

The American taxpayer is now pledged to give butter as well as guns to the Vietnamese fighting the Communist invaders. We are pledged to "social revolution" in Vietnam at the same time the administration has cut the school milk program for needy American boys and girls for fiscal 1967 from \$30 million way down to \$21 million. This is declared to be an austerity move in connection with Vietnam. This is what we used to call playing up to a neighbor while starving your own family.

This is the first practical step by which, through the Federal Government, the American taxpayers are going to raise the standard of living of the whole world. Let us hope this does not end up as such efforts usually do in lowering the standard of living in our own country.

The administration took what its spokesmen concede, is a calculated gamble in trying to produce both Federal guns and Federal butter here at home. Apparently someone forgot our kids would have to give up the milk to make the butter.

I suggest this financial irresponsibility, this making the taxpayer, without asking him, finance a world "revolution," is opposed to everything usually regarded as American.

THE ADMINISTRATION HAS COMMITTED THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER TO FINANCING A SOCIAL REVOLUTION IN VIETNAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, now that the administration has committed the American taxpayer to financing a social revolution in Vietnam, I wonder how they are going to make sure our social aid of millions or billions does not help the Vietcong.

If there are any true experts on Vietnam, the results to date there do not show it. But I have read in various publications, and in statements by our military, that one of the problems in South Vietnam is that the Vietcong are shooting at our American men one day and peacefully hoeing the primitive fields the next after burying for the time their weapons.

Do our Far Eastern wizards have some way of making sure that most of our taxpayers' money will not reach these farmers so peaceful one day and killing Americans and the innocent in Vietnam the next?

It has been noted that we have been pouring \$600 million down the social rathole in Vietnam and the Vietcong still fight.

Anyway, I thought it was the Soviet Union that fostered world revolution, not the United States. Are our taxpayers to be treated like serfs and called upon to pay and pay and pay to help

foreigners to a revolution without being consulted, let alone having a chance to vote?

BIG MEETING OF THE BRASS IN HONOLULU

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, we had a big meeting of the brass in Honolulu to deal with the rice paddy branch of the Great Society. A joint pledge was made for a "revolution"—a "social revolution"—which we are to finance.

This is the first practical demonstration we have had of committing the American taxpayer to pay for raising living standards through Government aid in all parts of the world. Outside of the fact that this could well break even this rich country, I find the idea of our conducting "social revolutions" and financing them abroad rather frightening.

I should like to point out that the administration has been pouring \$600 million of your money and mine into social reform in Vietnam and, as far as I can learn, the Vietcongs have not even been driven from the south of Vietnam yet.

Maybe if we pour in more of what the administration clearly regards as our unlimited resources, the Communists will not just hold their own but will win in Vietnam. The loser so far, anyway, is the American taxpayer who is tapped daily for some new giveaway.

ADEQUACY OF U.S. SHIPPING

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, the first 3 days of House Merchant Marine Subcommittee hearings on the adequacy of U.S. shipping in respect to Vietnam have been informative and enlightening. I am confident that these hearings ordered by the distinguished chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ], will focus attention on the broader question of the sufficiency of the American merchant marine in relation to its ability to carry our ocean-borne commerce and assume the burden of military logistical support when called upon.

The U.S. public must take a greater interest in our merchant marine. More people must seek answers to why American-flag ships carry less than 9 percent of our goods today and why we rank 12th among shipbuilding nations of the world.

I must, in all candor, say that I was amazed at the budget request for appropriations for only 11 to 13 ships for fiscal

year 1967 under the Federal ship construction program. In view of the possibility of a long drawn-out conflict in southeast Asia and other U.S. commitments throughout the world, this meager budget request seems incomprehensible. In 1959 the Maritime Administration recommended a level of 20 ships per year. Surely our needs today are not less. In 1961, 31 contracts for ships were awarded; by 1965 this figure had dropped to 14 ships.

There are few if any members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee who agree with the recommendations of the Interagency Maritime Task Force—comprised of representatives of nine Federal agencies—calling for a drastic curtailment of the ship construction program and for building of American ships in foreign shipyards. In my opinion such a policy would be self-defeating and neither in the interests of our maritime industry nor our country.

Mr. Thomas Gleason, president of the International Longshoremen's Association, was a witness today at the Merchant Marine Subcommittee hearings. Mr. Gleason has visited Vietnam on at least two occasions at the request of our Government. He testified that new ships can be unloaded 100 percent quicker than the old Victory ships and at 100 percent less cost to U.S. taxpayers. In reply to a question I addressed to him regarding the cut in ship construction funds that would allow no more than 13 new ships for fiscal 1967, Mr. Gleason commented:

The Egyptians build more than 13 ships per year.

The distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON], a member of the subcommittee, has spoken of the reserve fleet as a "pile of iron" that "cannot be activated fast enough."

Mr. Speaker, we cannot consider one phase of the plight of our U.S. merchant marine without considering the total picture. There must be speedy and drastic action to preserve the American merchant marine, to strengthen it, and to improve upon its quality. Certainly we have some of the most modern and up-to-date ships afloat, but we must look at the entire fleet and act accordingly. It has been my personal opinion for many years that the so-called runaway flag device should be curbed and many more cargo vessels should be built each year in U.S. shipyards with help from the U.S. Government.

The President of the United States in his 1965 state of the Union message pledged that he would recommend a new policy for our merchant marine. I sincerely hope that the Chief Executive will now consider it timely to introduce a bold new program calling for more U.S.-built ships of the highest quality, equipped with the most up-to-date equipment.

END U.S. DISCRIMINATION ABROAD

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I have today asked the President to end the religious discrimination practiced in the assignment of U.S. employees to some overseas posts. This outrageous practice is preventing assignment of qualified Jewish employees to U.S. posts in Arab bloc countries.

For several months I have been investigating this matter and my inquiries have now produced an admission of the administration's discriminatory practice in a letter which I have received from the Department of State.

By its demonstrated willingness to go along with the anti-Semitism practiced by these Arab bloc countries when assigning U.S. personnel abroad, the administration is guilty of following a double standard, properly outlawing discrimination by private employers at home but improperly discriminating in assigning its own employees abroad.

The Department of State informs me that:

While the United States does not normally take into account the religion of its employees in assigning them for duty abroad, this is regrettably a factor which cannot be ignored in the case of certain countries whose policies in this respect we cannot control however much we disagree with them. The United States tries not to assign any employee to a country where he will be unacceptable to the host government.

U.S. military and civilian employees are required to state their religion when applying for a visa to enter Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Saudi Arabia, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United Arab Republic. The State Department advises me that "a person of the Jewish faith might not be allowed to enter these countries."

The administration defends its discriminatory practice by pointing out that any government can refuse to accept an employee officially assigned by another government through the simple expediency of declaring him persona non grata.

The deplorable discrimination practiced by the administration in the assignment of U.S. employees to Arab bloc countries is a national disgrace. The people of this Nation can be justifiably outraged to learn that this administration has been practicing religious discrimination in the assignment of Government employees.

I have asked the President today to immediately advise all Government departments and agencies that no religious tests or distinctions will be tolerated in the travel or overseas assignment of Government employees.

A much-needed change of attitude by the administration might do a great deal to curb the effect of these anti-Semitic travel sanctions on U.S. citizens and employees.

The United States should refuse to respect the discriminatory restrictions which these nations seek to impose, not honor them. U.S. leadership in this matter might well attract widespread support from other nations.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in requesting most vigorously that President Johnson stop this discrimination at once.

Mr. Speaker, I should like at this point to insert an article from the Philadelphia Inquirer relating the disturbing case of a constituent, Edward P. Hunt, of Bala-Cynwyd, Pa. Mr. Hunt was fired from his job with the U.S. Army-Air Force Exchange Service last year when he refused to sign an anti-Israeli visa sought by the Libyan Government. He was reinstated with full back pay after I protested the firing to Defense Secretary McNamara.

PENTAGON BOWS ON BIAS PROTEST—AREA MAN WINS VISA CASE

WASHINGTON, November 13.—Congressional protests have won reinstatement and back pay for a graduate of St. Joseph's College in Philadelphia who was fired from his civilian job with a Pentagon agency for refusing to sign a visa declaration requested by the Libyan Government.

Edward P. Hunt, 31, would not sign because he regarded the declaration as anti-Jewish. "I just feel that discrimination against any religious group is wrong," he said.

TAUGHT TOLERANCE

Hunt is a Roman Catholic, one of 11 children of Mr. and Mrs. John J. Hunt, of 138 Union Avenue, Bala, Lower Merion Township. From his earliest years, he said, his parents taught him to respect the religious beliefs of others, even though they differed from his own.

Adherence to this teaching received perhaps its most severe test for Hunt last spring when he arrived at Nuremberg, Germany, on his way to Wheelus Air Force Base in Libya as a food management specialist of the Army-Air Force Exchange Service.

As related by Representative RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Republican, of Pennsylvania, who helped him win ultimate vindication, Hunt was asked in Nuremberg to sign a Libyan visa application containing the following statement:

"And I know that in case of obtaining any Israeli visa my visa to Libya will be considered invalid."

REFUSES TO SIGN

He refused, on the grounds that signing would make him party to the antireligious conviction of the Libyan Government toward Israel. Libya is a predominantly Moslem country.

SCHWEIKER said Hunt was warned he would be fired if he refused to sign the application. Citing his religious beliefs, Hunt withheld his signature and asked for a hearing. He got, instead, formal notice of his discharge from Brig. Gen. John D. Hintes, commanding general of the European Exchange System.

Returning to the United States at his own expense, Hunt told his story to SCHWEIKER at his office here on May 20. The Congressman wrote a letter of protest to Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara. Senators HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, and JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, also protested.

As a result, Hunt was notified in July he had been reinstated and was reimbursed his 2 months of lost pay, his travel expenses and the cost of shipping his car home from Libya. His point made, Hunt resigned and is now working for Automatic Retailers of America-Slater as manager for food and beverage service at the Davos Ranch Resort at Woodridge, N.Y.

EXPLAINS STAND

Interviewed by telephone at Woodridge, Hunt explained why he refused to sign the application.

"I just feel that discrimination against any religious group is wrong," he said. "I feel a particular affinity for the Hebrew faith because of its similarities to my own faith, the faith in which I was brought up."

Hunt said he has "great respect" for the Moslem faith as well, but believes its practitioners should neither persecute nor be persecuted.

"This goes back to when I was 7 or 8 years old," Hunt said. "During Lent my mother would tell me to stop in at church and say a prayer. Often I would stop at a Hebrew synagogue instead."

"I didn't see any difference then and I don't see the difference now."

COUSIN IS CHAPLAIN

Hunt's father operates an electrical contracting business. He has several cousins in the religious life, including Commander John O'Connor, a Navy chaplain recently decorated for his service in Vietnam.

Hunt was graduated from St. Joseph's College in 1956 with a major in political science, and had 8 years in the restaurant industry in this country before signing on with the Army-Air Force Exchange Service in September 1964.

The service operates post exchanges at U.S. military bases.

Hunt was assigned to Fort Knox, Ky., until January of this year, when he was transferred to Fort Belvoir, Va., for training before his assignment overseas.

A bachelor, Hunt said he signed on with the exchange service out of a desire to travel and also to broaden his professional experience.

There were times, he admitted, when he wondered whether he had made the wisest of choices. Particularly when he found himself several thousand miles from home—jobless at the command of an Army general.

PROBLEMS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE JOB CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], and I addressed this House with reference to problems in the administration of the Job Corps, as illustrated especially by a case in Mountain Home, Idaho. Although two of our colleagues, the gentleman from Idaho, Congressman COMPTON WHITE, and the gentleman from Florida, SAM GIBBONS, have adroitly answered with a smoke screen, both of these gentlemen and the Job Corps have admitted the truth of the important facts we presented. I regret that they chose to conceal these admissions amidst a rain of ill-conceived and unfounded charges that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], and I are misrepresenting an isolated case to undermine the Job Corps. I will not reply in kind because I have great respect for my colleagues. Let me simply say that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and I were proposing the Job Corps concept before either of these worthy gentlemen were in Congress and we have consistently advocated the merits of a sensible Job Corps program.

NOT AN ISOLATED CASE

I shall recount later in my remarks the specific admissions camouflaged by these gentlemen, but let me first deal with their charge that the Mountain Home incident

is an isolated case. Far from it. I shall cite today only a few of the large number of cases from all over the country.

CAMP GARY, TEX.

Last July, three Job Corps enrollees in Camp Gary, were charged with shooting two Air Force policemen. Having been booked for assault with intent to murder, they were returned to regular duty in the camp. Job Corps officials hired three separate lawyers to defend the enrollees and the case has not yet come to trial due to delays and "absence of key witnesses."

CAMP BRECKENRIDGE

In August last year a Job Corpsman on leave in Billings, Mont., was charged with shooting at a policeman and wounding a woman in a Billings bar. Job Corps officials not only posted a \$2,500 bond and are paying for an attorney, they have flown the enrollee and a security guard back and forth from Camp Breckenridge, Ky., to Billings at least twice and perhaps more. The case has still not come to trial and the corpsman remains an enrollee in Camp Breckenridge. The apparent estimate of cost in this case is a minimum of \$1,000 to the taxpayers and perhaps a great deal more. Senator LEE METCALF, Democrat of Montana, was quoted as saying:

The idea of the Job Corps in my opinion is a great idea, but this incident is wrong and really burns me up.

The Senator continues:

These dropouts and malcontents are being coddled and complimented for their derogatory behavior.

KINGSPORT, TENN.

In December a warrant was issued in Kingsport, Tenn., against two young men for allegedly bludgeoning two victims with a lead pipe. They left the town that morning for two Illinois Job Corps camps before the warrant could be served.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on with examples of this nature. Job Corps camps are, and should be, for hard core youngsters, many of whom have had brushes with the law. They need sympathetic understanding. They also need to learn discipline and social values such as respect for law and order. The present policy of Job Corps officials too often undermines this whole purpose.

MOUNTAIN HOME, IDAHO

In the Mountain Home case, my two colleagues and the Job Corps have now openly admitted the following devastating facts:

First. An enrollee named Paul Dennis Jones did attack a fellow corpsman with a deadly weapon in a Job Corps dormitory.

Second. Jones was a three-time felony loser, including conviction for attempted murder.

Third. Job Corps screening procedures are so haphazard that they had no idea of Jones' previous record when they took him in the Job Corps.

Fourth. Jones was in a capacity of leadership in the Mountain Home Camp, serving as dormitory leader, wing leader, and squad leader.

Fifth. The Job Corps does not deny that the victim of the assault was

drummed out of the Job Corps by friends of Jones.

Sixth. The Job Corps did pay for an attorney and apparently for psychiatric treatment. A maximum of \$50 of this cost may be deducted from the enrollee's readjustment allowance, the rest to be paid from Job Corps funds.

Seventh. Job Corps officials from Washington did telegraph the court that they would accept Jones back in the Job Corps. This was done at the time of sentencing by the court, when the full probation report showing his previous convictions was certainly available. Job Corps officials blithely claim that even at that time, when they agreed to accept Jones back, they knew nothing of his previous felony record.

Eighth. The Job Corps still has no procedure for screening applicants with felony records so that they can conform to parole and probation requirements.

Mr. Speaker, the latter point raises one of the silliest of the answers apparently given to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], by Job Corps officials. I quote my colleague:

There is no national file of parolees or juvenile offenders; and there is no way, except for a prohibitively costly security check, in which every facet of an applicant's life can be checked.

I would inform my colleague and the Job Corps that every State maintains records of parolees and probationers in a bureau of identification. In addition, if applicants were fingerprinted, as every inductee in the military service is fingerprinted, felony records could be checked overnight with the FBI. This is done constantly by sheriffs and police officials in our smallest communities around the country.

Mr. Speaker, when the Job Corps takes an applicant who has a felony record, they should know about it. The Job Corps has a direct responsibility to work out provisions so that they are not a party to removing parolees and probationers from States, thereby violating State law. I am informed that the Council of State Governments has been unsuccessfully trying to work out this matter with the Job Corps. It should be done immediately. The cases the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and I have cited are but a few of the many that have occurred in the Job Corps. They are not isolated instances. They are established policy of the Job Corps.

I am aggrieved that our two colleagues chose to slash back blindly and personally when we brought the Mountain Home case to the attention of the House. Our statements were based solidly on facts compiled by the attorney general of Idaho, Mr. Allan Shepard, and a large number of other officials in Idaho, including the prosecuting attorney, Mr. Fred Kennedy, who told me he had reviewed the attorney general's memo and approved it. As I stated to the House on Tuesday, the prosecuting attorney wanted it made clear that Job Corps officials cooperated with him fully after he refused to return Jones to the Mountain Home Camp for administrative action.

I include at this point in the RECORD the full memorandum of facts given to us by Idaho officials, along with an excerpt from Bulletin No. 66-40 of the Job Corps, relating to legal services for corpsmen in Job Corps conservation centers:

DECEMBER 31, 1965.

This memorandum is written at the combined suggestions of certain persons who attended a meeting recently in the office of Mr. Sylvan Jeppesen, U.S. attorney. In attendance were Mr. Fred Kennedy, prosecuting attorney for Elmore County, Mr. L. E. Clapp, warden of the Idaho State Penitentiary, Mr. Mark Maxwell, vice chairman of the board of corrections, Mr. Al Roard, parole and probation officer, Mr. Bill Lesh, of the Employment Security Agency, Mr. Allen G. Shepard, attorney general of the State of Idaho and his two assistants.

Mr. Jeppesen stated that he had been requested by Senator CHURCH to attend said meeting, which was called primarily at the instance of Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Clapp.

The discussion involved a recent criminal incident at the Job Corps camp at Mountain Home, Idaho. It was the consensus of those present at the meeting that the entire congressional delegation should be informed both as to the circumstances and the thinking of the group regarding corrective action which should be taken.

On or about November 15, 1965, a vicious fight took place in one of the dormitories of the Job Corps camp at Mountain Home. Said assault allegedly took place as a result of Truley Tillman, a corpsman, playing a radio in a manner disturbing to the other occupants of the dormitory. The dormitory leader, one Paul Dennis Jones, brutally beat Truley Tillman about the head and face. While sitting astride the prone body of Tillman, Jones produced a knife and slashed Tillman about the face and hands, and then plunged the knife into the abdomen of Tillman inflicting a wound of approximately 2½ inches in depth.

The matter was reported almost immediately to Mr. Kennedy as county prosecutor. Because of the question of Federal enclave, the Federal Bureau of Investigation had been called. An FBI investigator was dispatched to the scene that night, interrogated Jones and obtained from him a statement admitting participation in the assault. Mr. Kennedy was approached that night by officials of the Job Corps, who attempted to convince Mr. Kennedy that there should be no criminal proceedings filed against Jones and he should be released to the Corps for administrative action. No person in the Job Corps camp, either corpsmen or official, would sign the criminal complaint against Jones for assault with a deadly weapon, and Mr. Kennedy was, therefore, required to sign the complaint himself.

It was necessary to issue subpoenas and require attendance of Job Corps witnesses in court. The Job Corps officials, through their Washington, D.C., office, hired Mr. Robert Rowett, an attorney at Mountain Home, to represent the accused at Federal expense.

At the hearing held therein, Jones entered a plea of guilty to assault with a deadly weapon, and as is usual in such cases, the district judge deferred imposing sentence pending presentence investigation.

At the hearing for sentencing, officials from the Job Corps camp were present. A telegram from the Job Corps headquarters in Washington, D.C., was submitted to the court, which requested that the judge place Jones on probation and affirmatively stated that if said Jones were placed on probation by the court he would be accepted by the Job Corps and returned to the Job Corps camp.

In the course of the presentence investigation, it was determined that Jones is a three-time loser on felony charges, having been

convicted and served sentences in California State correctional institutions. The criminal record of Jones can be summarized as follows: At the age of 16, he attempted to kill two persons by firing nine shots from a revolver. He was admitted to the California Fort Springs Boy's Camp. In 1962 he was convicted of auto theft and received a jail sentence and 3 years probation. Later in 1962, he was convicted of auto theft and sentenced to an additional 2 years probation. In 1963, he was adjudged a parole violator, convicted of another auto theft and sentenced to the Soledad Correctional Institution. In 1964, he was paroled and on September 8, 1965, was arrested for driving with a revoked or suspended driver's license, and served a total of 25 days in jail.

At the time of his induction into the Job Corps, he was, and still remains a parolee of California correctional system. Idaho, as are all States, is a member of the Interstate Compact on Parole and Probations. Under the terms of said compact, each State agrees that it will not permit one of its parolees or probationers to move to another State's jurisdiction without, in advance, informing the receiving State of such desire and making arrangements for the supervision of such parolee or probationer by the receiving State during the balance of parolee or probationer's time. No such notification was received by the State of Idaho, or its board of corrections from either the State of California or the Job Corps. We were informed that said Jones, while at the Job Corps camp, was made a supervisor of other corpsmen in three capacities: Dormitory leader, wing leader, and squad leader which would indicate he had rather close supervision of other corpsmen.

Mr. Kennedy has further stated that he has received practically no cooperation from fellow job corpsmen witnesses in investigating or processing the defendant for what is obviously a serious crime in the felony category. This, in spite of the fact that the defendant was a three-time convicted felon and but for extremely fortunate circumstances, his latest victim would have died.

One of the eyewitnesses to the assault, another corpsman, called by Mr. Kennedy to testify under oath, refused to state that he had seen the assault with the knife, although standing within 3 feet of the scene. Mr. Kennedy states that he is convinced that this witness is guilty of outright perjury. The victim of the assault was so mistreated and threatened by friends of Jones that he has now resigned from the Job Corps and has left the State of Idaho.

Jones was recently brought before the Third District Court in Boise for sentencing, at which time Job Corps officials and his lawyer, Mr. Rowett, also appeared. The district judge, Hon. J. Ray Durtschi, withheld sentence on Jones and placed him on probation for 2 years, with the condition that he serve 4 months in jail, and then return to the Job Corps. A further condition was that he receive psychiatric treatment.

I am sure I reflect the consensus of the group in stating that the concept of the Job Corps and the philosophy which led to its establishment is laudable in every respect. Such provides an opportunity for underprivileged youth to be trained for work and obtain necessary education. We think it is obvious that a group of young people in the 16 to 21 age bracket, most of whom are lacking in education and in the opportunity to compete in our society, are perhaps the most highly impressionable group of persons who could be assembled. Many of them have already had minor brushes with the law. I cannot think of a greater tragedy than having such a group of young people exposed to what is obviously a vicious and mentally disturbed person. To compound the problem, such a person was placed in a position of authority and responsibility over these same highly impressionable corpsmen.

We feel from this incident can be drawn the obvious conclusion that the screening process of the Job Corps is at times, at least, a complete failure. We are informed that the officials at the local Job Corps camp are unable to, or have not determined how many, if any, of their corpsmen are on a present active status of parole or probation from other States. The State board of corrections is reasonably positive that such situations exist and in conformance with the interstate compact, are desirous of being informed of the existence of parolees and probationers from other States who are presently residing within Idaho. We feel this is particularly necessary since we are informed that the Job Corps has no interest in the supervision of parolees or probationers.

We also feel it pertinent to point out that the officials of the State of Idaho concerned with supervising probationers and parolees have had very fine cooperation with the armed services regarding such supervisory problems.

It is also the consensus of the group that the basic concept of a Job Corps, as announced to the public at large, was not to provide rehabilitation institutions for criminals. The public acceptance of the Job Corps locations was, we felt, based on the asserted purpose of the Job Corps as providing training and education for underprivileged young people who deserved an opportunity.

From my own personal standpoint, and while I may not reflect the consensus of the group, I must state that I am highly shocked and indignant at the use of Federal moneys to furnish legal counsel, bail, psychiatric evaluation and treatment, etc., to an accused, regardless of whether he be a Federal employee, State employee or whatever.

As you know, our system of criminal justice in the State of Idaho for many years has required the appointment of legal counsel for indigent defendants and the reports of our supreme court are replete with opinions stating that the failure to fully and fairly advise an accused of his right to legal counsel, and to furnish such counsel, constitutes the deprivation of constitutional rights. I seriously question the existence of any statutory authorization for such expenditure of Federal funds. Such certainly has never been the case in regard to armed services personnel and I can see no difference between the furnishing of counsel to a job corpsman, Federal employee, and the furnishing of legal counsel to a mailman, a U.S. attorney, an elevator operator in a post office building or a U.S. Senator, any one of whom could be charged with murder or an attempted murder.

We sincerely believe that these matters demand your attention and investigation, if the Job Corps is to continue to have the public confidence and carry out the very laudable program for which it was designed.

I should add that Mr. Kennedy some time ago, wrote to the Director of the program, Mr. Sargent Shriver, relative to the problems discussed herein, and has not, as yet, received the courtesy of a reply.

ALLAN G. SHEPARD,
Attorney General,
State of Idaho.

EXCERPTS FROM THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY BULLETIN No. 66-40

It is Job Corps policy to provide legal services to corpsmen faced with criminal proceedings. The Job Corps is intensely interested in protection of the rights of corpsmen at all times from the moment they are enroute to Job Corps conservation centers for initial assignments until they are discharged.

Attorney's fees shall be deducted from the corpsman's readjustment allowance at a rate of \$5 per hour for time expended in a judicial proceeding and \$3 per hour for time expended in office consultation and preparation. The total amount thus deducted from the corps-

man's readjustment allowance shall not exceed \$50 in any case. The difference between the corpsman's contribution to his legal defense payments and the actual fees of the attorney will be paid by Job Corps up to the limits of the Criminal Justice Act of 1964. Reasonably necessary expenses incurred by the attorney in handling the case will be reimbursed by the Job Corps, but will not be charged to the corpsman.

When a corpsman is faced with criminal proceedings, the center director should retain an attorney to represent him.

Provide the corpsman with the opportunity to select an attorney of his choice, and inform the corpsman that fees will be deducted from his readjustment allowance at the rate of \$5 per hour for time expended in a judicial proceeding and \$3 per hour for time expended in office consultation and preparation, up to the \$50 limit. If the corpsman refuses an attorney on this basis, the center director should attempt to have an attorney supplied by a local legal service organization or appointed by the court. In any case where a corpsman is faced with criminal proceedings, the center director should immediately notify Job Corps Operations Center by teletype.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. Is it not true that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], were not basically opposed to the principle of fighting poverty? I know that the gentlemen are interested in the battle against poverty. Their opposition, therefore, is not on the basis of principle but on the basis of the administration of the program, the way it is put together, and the manner in which it was pushed through the Congress, as well as the manner in which the administration was attempting to rush this through—partially for political gain. Is that a good summation?

Mr. GOODELL. It certainly is. I thank the gentleman for that observation; and I would document this with the fact that both the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and I, proposed a residential skills center on an experimental basis as early as 1961. We proposed it then as an amendment to the Juvenile Delinquency Act.

I have long believed that there is a place for this kind of training center, for youngsters requiring a change of environment in order to respond to education and training. We wanted it done at that time, in 1961, on an experimental basis, and then to extend this experience into a broader national program.

We were opposed in that effort by the administration and by the leadership of the committee at that time. Subsequently, in 1963, we were able to get a residential skills center as an amendment to the Vocational Education Act, which was landmark legislation in 1963. It would have provided for a major installation here in the District of Columbia and in several other metropolitan areas.

Once again, however, the administration did not fund this program, so that it never got off the ground.

In 1964 the poverty program started mass production of Job Corps camps,

without the benefit of the experience that would have prevented many of these problems.

I will say to the gentleman that I strongly favor the Job Corps concept, and I think Mr. QUIE and I have proven this by our record.

We also proposed preschool and early school training as early as 1961. This was before it derived its name from our gracious first lady of Headstart, when it was put in as a part of the poverty program in 1964.

From 1961 through 1963 we were trying to get such a program funded federally through our States and our educational system. I believe this has been essentially a successful program despite some administrative problems with it, but we could not get it until 1964 in the Poverty Act when it was put in as a part of the community action program. Unfortunately, because it was put in there, they are not getting enough funds and we will not be able to fund anywhere near all of the applications for Headstart in the coming year. There are something like \$650 million in applications for Headstart pending. In the President's new budget he has put \$260 million for this, which will fund about half of these programs out of the poverty program.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. GOODELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. Is it not also true, aside from the point you have mentioned, that the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], were instrumental in developing many amendments that were opposed during the writing of this bill, which were automatically defeated by the other side of the aisle for reasons that are difficult to understand, due to the fact that not enough time was given to a study of these amendments? Was it the feeling of the gentleman from New York, that this was true?

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman from California is too modest. He served on the same committee. He also prepared and offered a great many amendments in the committee and on the floor with reference to the poverty program when it was originally proposed and debated in 1964. The gentleman is absolutely correct. At that time there was a feeling prevailing in this Congress that we could not change the poverty program at all. They had to take what the President offered us without constructive change of any nature. Democrats and Republicans had amendments turned down in the committee on this basis. Subsequently, in 1965, when many of us were concerned about the problems that had developed, and which incidentally we had been warning of in the original debate, we were still unable to get constructive amendments properly considered in the committee or on the floor. They were voted down almost automatically.

Mr. BELL. If the gentleman will yield further, is it not true there were some amendments proposed, and the one that comes to mind is the one referred to as the "three-legged stool," under which

certain members of the poverty areas would be represented on the various committees?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes.

Mr. BELL. These proposals were made, but were defeated in committee. They were the very proposals that would have precluded the controversy over representation of the poor. As I recall it, it was proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct. Mr. QUIE offered a specific amendment in committee and offered it again on the floor of the House. I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], offered one on the floor, also, to require participation of the poor at the policy-making level. Mr. QUIE's amendment was to require at least one-third of the representatives on the community action board to be selected by, and representative of, the poor themselves. This amendment was turned down by the other side of the aisle with the words that it was not necessary. I think the history of the poverty program since those amendments were offered proves how necessary they were. We could have avoided a great deal of difficulty, and the waste of human resources and monetary resources which occurred, if we had taken that amendment at that time.

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TODD. I take it that the gentleman is offering constructive criticism of Job Corps operations.

Mr. GOODELL. I certainly am. I want it taken in that spirit. I think that the original speech that Mr. QUIE and I made on Monday was constructive in this respect. We pointed out how much we believe in the Job Corps concept if it is done properly. We are very concerned at the philosophy which we think now permeates the administration of the Job Corps in this respect.

Mr. TODD. Would the gentleman agree, with a massive need such as we have in terms of education of the boys who need help, that we need a massive program? And, of course, to develop a massive program we realize that we need new concepts of education and that we require patience, understanding, and a degree of imagination? We have to try this, and if this does not succeed, we have to try that. Really, time is going to be the test of whether this is the most successful and most economical and most helpful way for the boys to become productive and responsible members of society. Would the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. GOODELL. I agree very wholeheartedly with the concept of experimentation and demonstration. I agree that the Job Corps offers a very significant opportunity here to help youngsters who need help in helping themselves. I strongly support this concept. As I said in my earlier remarks, I wish that in 1961, when Mr. QUIE and I were proposing this on an experimental basis, we had been able to get the votes and the sup-

port of the administration. Then we could have had experience in some of these camps before we launched into mass production of camps. But the point of my remarks and those of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] on Monday is that we should get this back on the track now. There are demonstrated mistakes being made by the Job Corps officials in their training and in their selection of enrollees. One of the worst things that is happening is the haphazard screening process when they take these enrollees. As the gentleman is perhaps aware, I was the author of the Manpower Development and Training Act that was substituted here on the floor of the House in 1962. We have many facets of that program that are available to young people 16 to 22.

Then, we expanded it the following year on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. Speaker, there should be an evaluation of each youngster in order to see if he can best perform some of this kind of work in his home environment under manpower or other programs, or if he should be transferred to a Job Corps camp elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, the Job Corps policy is to send these boys a long way from their home. There should be a very careful evaluation to determine if this is the best thing for a particular youngster. That kind of careful evaluation, coordinated with other programs, is not being followed today. It is a very haphazard operation.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TODD. Is it my understanding that the Job Corps does have such an evaluation program underway, and that they do hope to make some determinations in order to determine whether it is advisable to send boys as far away as they do at the present time? In my consideration this is still an open question, and it is difficult to resolve, I believe, because of the very nature of the program. We cannot say whether or not this or that is a correct answer as to the course we may have to follow within the next year or two. We would like to have more reliable figures and other data on which to act in order to come to that judgment.

Mr. GOODELL. I will concede that in any large program of this nature one could expect some mistakes to be made in any event in the screening and the assignment of these boys. But in this instance there is really no good, acceptable screening procedure being followed by the Job Corps.

This case that I cited of the three-time felony loser who was taken to the Job Corps camp at Mountain Home, Idaho, is a case well in point. This boy was put into a position of leadership over other boys. This represents a good example of what I am talking about, because the Job Corps officials, when we pointed this out to them on the floor of the House on Monday, responded that they had no idea that he was on parole. We said "Why can you not check this kind of thing? You certainly can find out if a man has been convicted three

times as a felon. We have all of the fingerprint records in the FBI to which you can go." The Job Corps said that they do not fingerprint these boys. But we do fingerprint all of the inductees who are taken into the military service. I do not feel that these young men who are taken into the Job Corps are any better than the average boy who serves his country in the military service. I do believe that it is a very simple procedure to determine an applicant's criminal record. I do not say that they should automatically bar people who have a felony record from the Job Corps camps. However, I believe they ought to know about that record. Proper experts ought to assess this problem fully before they induct a man into the Job Corps. Their haphazard kind of screening is very well illustrated by the Mountain Home case. However, we obviously have many, many other examples of this kind of thing, not quite as extreme as the case at Mountain Home. The Job Corps by their selection procedures cannot even tell how many fugitives from justice they have in their camps, perhaps leading the other enrollees with official authority.

The Job Corps officials finally responded by saying:

We were referred this man Jones from the California Employment Security Office, and they never told us that he had a felony record.

This clearly illustrates the fact that the Job Corps officials do not have a screening procedure themselves. They apparently just said to the office in California "Send us some young men that you think will work out in a Job Corps program," and the employment service did so. It is not the obligation of the employment service to find out if a man has a felony record, but it should be the responsibility of the Job Corps.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TODD. I would like to comment to the effect that I, too, believe that we should offer constructive criticism to the operations of the Job Corps. I feel that this has been one of my responsibilities. I have tried to offer my suggestions in a constructive manner. I am well aware of some of the administrative problems which they have had. I think these problems have been most difficult in some cases. I think they could have solved them more rapidly and with a much better effect on the community involved.

But at the present time I am inclined to believe that these problems—at least, those with which I am familiar—are well on their way to being behind us. I believe that in the last year the Job Corps with which I am familiar has made great progress, and that there is a reasonable expectation that it will fulfill its important duties.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Michigan, and I wish I were as optimistic as he is about this. However, I see no indication at this point, from the highest level of the Office of Economic Opportunity or the Job Corps, that they are going to change the present policy of handling

situations such as that described at Mountain Home, where this assault occurred. They are defending it. They are not admitting any mistakes, except one: "We did not know he had three felony convictions on his record." However, they took Jones into the Job Corps and when this situation came to light they threw up their arms and said: "How are we to know? How could we possibly know?"

Mr. Speaker, any village police chief of this country could tell them how to find out about felony records, and if they do not know how to do this, they are not competent to be in charge of the Job Corps in this country.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. I would like to commend the gentleman from New York for the study which he has made of the poverty program in the last 2 years. I also commend him for his efforts throughout the country to bring out the difficult problems that this program faces as a result of poor administration and the poor wording of the bill in its conception.

I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that as a result of his efforts, we may bring some changes in this legislation through sound amendments.

Then perhaps we may all share some of the optimism of the gentleman on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend the gentleman for the statement he has made to the House of Representatives with respect to this situation. To me it is incredible that there should be, especially in any Job Corps camp, a leader of young men who is a three-time loser on felony convictions. This is unpardonable. It is inexcusable to put that kind of a leader over young men who have clean records. I am unable to understand why the administration of the Job Corps is so lax that this sort of thing can possibly happen.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. Let me say that the stock answer that has been given to that is that we are harping on an isolated case. Unfortunately, the tragic thing about it is that it is not an isolated case. The Job Corps by its own admission has said they could have hundreds of felony violators in the Job Corps camps because they do not know whether the Job Corps enrollees have felony records or not. They do not know whether they are on probation or on parole in a State. The obligation under parole or probation is to remain in a State under supervision.

The Job Corps goes in and solicits young men and takes them out to a Job Corps camp somewhere else, where they are in violation of parole. The Job Corps officials then come back, and my two colleagues come back, and say that the Job Corps did not violate the interstate compact on parole and probation. The Federal Government is not a party

to these compacts, they say. The States make these compacts. The Federal Government is not bound by it. What kind of a technical evasion is that? The Federal Government put these boys in the Job Corps camp, having taken them out of the States where they are supposed to remain under supervision.

This kind of thing is going on elsewhere as you know. The Job Corps officials refuse to say that they will change this policy. They should call such slipshod practices to an abrupt halt.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by saying once again—I am a very strong advocate of a poverty war—I believe this country has been waging an effective war on poverty throughout its history. We were spending in 1964, when we passed the poverty act, \$100 billion total from State, Federal, and local and private sources to fight poverty. This fact was cited in a social security bulletin from the administration itself. We urgently need to do more. The right kind of war on poverty can win this important war in the future—in the foreseeable future.

But the kind of war that we are waging today will not do that. It wastes money and wastes human resources and worst of all, it plants the seeds of even greater frustration and cynicism in the poor who have had their expectations raised so high by the great fanfare attached to the war on poverty.

CURB NUCLEAR WEAPONS SPREAD

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the gravest threat to mankind today—graver even than the war in Vietnam and starvation in the subcontinent—arises from the rapid spread of nuclear weapons. It is essential that we find some means to curtail further proliferation.

I have today introduced a resolution calling for stepped-up U.S. efforts on this most serious problem.

I should like now to express my strongly held view that all present nuclear powers, including France and Red China, should be invited to the World Disarmament Conference recently proposed by the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

While I recognize that any treaty that may be negotiated with other nations in this field would be referred to the U.S. Senate, the limitations of nations having independent nuclear weapon capability is of such importance to the whole world that an indication of the consensus of the House of Representatives as well as the Senate is desirable.

ENACT A FAIR PACKAGING AND LABELING LAW NOW

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM] may extend his

remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a fair packaging and labeling bill, similar to S. 985 introduced by my esteemed colleague, Senator HART, of Michigan, during the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is frequently said that there is nothing new under the sun. Whether this statement is true or not, the concept of legislation to enforce truthful packaging and labeling is certainly not new.

This year, 1966, marks the 60th anniversary of the original pure food and drugs law, enacted in 1906. This act forbade adulteration and misbranding of foods and drugs sold in interstate commerce.

The 1906 law was a milestone in the history of pure food and drugs and truth-in-packaging legislation.

The next substantial amendment to the basic law occurred 32 years later when the Copeland Act or the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938, passed.

Without going into details at this time, let me just state that this new act strengthened earlier definitions of adulteration and misbranding. Essentially, the act requires that foods, drugs, and cosmetics sold in interstate commerce must meet certain minimum requirements of purity, safety, and labeling.

During the hearings held as early as 1933 on proposed amendments to the 1906 law, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce, chaired by Senator Royal S. Copeland, of New York, many ingenious arguments were cited in opposition. For example, the proposed bill was deemed a "further attempt to extend Government control over business."

Furthermore, one witness declared:

If we are to meet adjustments proposed by the bill, then you are going to have thousands, yes, millions of dollars lost.

These costs would, of course, necessarily be passed on to the consumer.

Then again, another witness declared that existing laws are adequate; the need is for more vigorous enforcement of these laws. This witness could see nothing wrong with the cumbersome existing procedure of enforcement by which the Government must prove violation of the law on an individual case by case basis.

Eventually those who favored additional legislation won the day in 1938.

In a nutshell, their point of view was this: "The 1906 law has been effective in controlling adulterated and misbranded foods and drugs; it has served to correct many of the abuses that existed at the time of its enactment. But present-day conditions in the food and drug industries are very different from what they were more than a quarter century ago."

And now here we are in the 1960's and again there is much agitation for further truth-in-packaging legislation.

Let me mention briefly some of the most common deceptive practices which

have made necessary new legislation to close the gaps in existing law.

First. Lack of standardization of sizes of products and proliferation of fractional amounts.

Because of the widespread use of fractional measures, it is frequently impossible for shoppers to compare prices of goods.

For example, which is the better buy? Two 6¾-ounce cans of tuna fish for 63 cents, or one 9¼-ounce can for 43 cents?

In today's market, the plain ordinary pound has frequently shrunk to 15½ ounces, the half-pound is 7¾ or 7½ ounces.

One Federal weights-and-measures official tells us that potato chip packages come in 74 different sizes all under 3 pounds.

Second. Use of deceptive sizes, shapes, and proportions to exaggerate the quantity inside.

For example, plastic jars of hair pomade often look as if they would hold 2 ounces but thanks to hollow sides and a hollow bottom actually held only 1 ounce.

Third. Use of deceptive descriptive adjectives, such as "jumbo quart," "giant" size, and so forth.

When introducing a State truth-in-packaging bill, a Wisconsin State legislator cited the following example of confusion in the marketplace: Among three sizes of soap powder sold by the same manufacturer, there was the "king size" package, containing 5 pounds, 11 ounces, and costing \$1.33; the "giant size," containing 3 pounds, 5½ ounces, and costing 79 cents; and the regular size, containing 1 pound, 6 ounces, at a cost of 32 cents. It is difficult to tell at a glance or even to figure with pencil and paper which is the best buy. However, "king size" and "giant size" suggest a bargain. Long division will show in this case that the best buy was the regular size package.

Fourth. "Cents off" promotions. Cents-off labels do not provide the meaningful price information they appear to. They are not price guides at all. They are promotional devices designed to make the buyer believe he is being offered a bargain, and they are deceptive because bargains cannot be determined without price comparisons.

Fifth. Labels with very fine print, obscure location of information, and lack of contrasting colors. For instance, Consumers Union received the following letter:

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
March 8, 1965.

DEAR CONSUMERS UNION: ———'s stores have large signs in their windows: "Almond bark, \$1.08." It doesn't say per pound or per box or what weight—it says nothing else.

My question to the saleslady produced the following reply: "It is 12 ounces." Upon my query: "Does it say so on the box?" she replied, "I'll try to find it for you. They want people to think it is 1 pound." I enclose the "12 ounces net weight" marking she found on the box; print about 3/32-inch high in a color blending into the color of the box.

This proves again how necessary legislation is as to size and contrasting color of print concerning contents.

Should there already be a regulation by the department of markets of New York City

or by some other Government agency, I request that you call their attention to this.

B. G. F.

Sixth. Advertisement of misleading servings. Congressman SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York, stated in his testimony on the proposed 1965 fair packaging and labeling measure:

Another interesting phenomenon may be witnessed in advertisements which boldly proclaim "four servings" or "six servings." These may be true if we are serving small children who have been nibbling all day long, but if the product is intended to be served to adults, then these ads are grossly misleading.

Seven. Slack fill. One of the most common complaints of consumers is "slack fill." This refers especially to the detergent industry.

As one pamphlet on packaging practices stated:

There's nothing like air to fill a package. The practice of letting air occupy a significant part of the container is known as "slack fill." Manufacturers usually excuse slack fill by claims that the product settles in the box. Slack fill goes beyond normal settling and is a prevalent practice.

My bill could correct these abuses by:

First. Requiring the net quantity of contents to be stated on either the front panel of packages or labels affixed thereto.

Second. Establishing minimum standards with respect to the prominence of net quantity statements.

Third. Prohibiting the addition to such statements of qualifying words.

Fourth. Specifying exceptions to the foregoing which may be required because of the nature of the particular commodity.

Fifth. Prohibiting the placement upon such packages by persons other than retailers of data relating to possible retail price savings through the purchase of the commodity.

Sixth. Preventing the use of deceptive illustrative matter on packages.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Federal Trade Commission to promulgate regulations, and additional regulations as needed, to preserve fair competition among competing products by enabling consumers to make rational comparisons and to prevent deception.

Such regulations would:

First. Establish reasonable weights or quantities in which the commodity would be distributed for retail sale, provided that no weight established is less than 2 ounces.

Second. Prevent distribution of packages likely to deceive retail purchasers as to net quantity with exceptions for certain packages of distinctive appearance.

Third. Establish standards relating to package size which may be used to characterize quantitatively the contents of packages.

Fourth. Define the net quantity of a commodity which constitutes a serving if such commodity bears a representation as to the number of servings contained.

Fifth. Define standards for the quantitative designation of package contents if such cannot be described in terms of weight, measure, or count.

Sixth. Require the ingredients and composition of commodities to be placed in a prominent position.

Jurisdiction over food, drugs, and cosmetics would be assigned to the Food and Drug Administration of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, while all other consumer commodities would be under the authority of the Federal Trade Commission.

Let me now review briefly what I consider to be the main arguments in favor of my bill.

First. Informed demand by consumers for goods and services is, theoretically at least, the force which directs production into appropriate channels. However, it is very difficult to make rational choices based on quality, quantity, and price, in view of the many different sizes and shapes of packages, cans, and bottles of food products and other merchandise.

Second. If a fair packaging and labeling bill were enacted into law, most of the abuses which I discussed a moment ago would become illegal.

Third. Cheating resulting from questionable packaging techniques is blatant dishonesty.

Fraud and cheating are commonly practiced in our prepackaged foods—

Charged Arch W. Troelstrup, chairman of the Consumer Education Department of Stephens College. Some sources claim that the American consumer is done out of almost \$20 million in grain products alone by these tactics.

Fourth. The ethical businessman is penalized by unfair marketing methods. The honest dealer is severely handicapped by trickery involved in misleading labeling and packaging.

Mr. George P. Larrick, the former Commissioner of Food and Drugs, said in testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee in April 1965, that although most businessmen endeavored to label and package their products legally, a minority indulge in "dishonest and undesirable practices and that this forces the honest competitor to adopt such practices to remain in business."

Mr. Larrick reported further that his agency, the Food and Drug Administration, receives as many complaints about unfair packaging from businessmen as from customers—even more.

Fifth. Protective powers under existing legislation are inadequate for today's conditions.

The Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act are the basic laws concerned with the commodities and practices covered by the bill. In part, they respectively prohibit labeling that "is false or misleading in any particular" or the use of containers "so made, formed, or filled as to be misleading," and "unfair methods of competition in commerce, and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce."

However, the conventional weapons in present legislation were not designed to deal with the complexities of the modern marketplace. Instead, they were designed to deal with the occasional deception which was not a great problem when the relatively few products then available were sold across the counter in the neighborhood store.

Essentially, present law fails for lack of any enforceable authority at all, or for lack of authority to establish generally applicable standards of interpretation. Where authority does not technically exist, each case must nonetheless be fought out individually with no general ground rules for reference. It is no wonder that enforcement is inadequate.

For example, the Food and Drug Administration had one case—concerning packaging of thin mints—in the courts for 3 years and finally lost it. So this requires the Food and Drug Administration to proceed on a case by case without general ground rules to which it can refer and which it can enforce on the manufacturers subject to its jurisdiction.

Of course there is opposition to this bill. It is opposition very much akin to the opposition to the Food and Drug Act 60 years ago. As then, opponents of this measure claim that it is antibusiness, that it involves an unwarranted additional extension of Government into the affairs of business, that it is enough to enforce the laws now on the statute books. In hearings on truth in packaging last spring, we heard such statements as:

The bill would restrict price reducing competition, be costly to enforce, and hurt free enterprise.

And—

It will immeasurably increase the cost to the consumer and will not give the consumer any benefits not already provided by existing law.

But just as the fears to the woeful impact of the food and drug laws have proved to be an unwarranted myth, so we need not take too seriously the forebodings of the present opponents of truth in packaging.

Ladies and gentlemen, in the midst of our grave concern over world developments, especially our commitments in southeast Asia, let us not forget the homefront and abandon the goals of the Great Society. To protect the American consumer against abuses in packaging and labeling and to protect the American businessman against unfair methods of competition, we must delay no longer in passing a fair packaging and labeling law. Therefore I urge favorable action by this legislative body on my bill, H.R. 12759.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight Tuesday, February 15, to file a report on H.R. 12752.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (at the request of Mr. FOUNTAIN), for February 10 through February 28, 1966, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ROONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, February 16; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. RYAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. GROSS), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. GOODELL (at the request of Mr. GROSS), for 60 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. RESNICK during his special order today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. TUNNEY.

Mr. PERKINS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TODD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. SATERFIELD.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GROSS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. BOLTON.

Mr. SAYLOR.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. TODD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HUOT.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1698. An act to establish a procedure for the review of proposed bank mergers so as to eliminate the necessity for the dissolution of merged banks, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 14, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives,

the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 89th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (2 U.S.C. 25), approved February 18, 1948: WALTER B. JONES, First District, North Carolina.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2025. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2026. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of audit of the exchange stabilization fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2027. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the disposal of certain foreign excess property, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 398, 40 U.S.C. 514; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2028. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

2029. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 232, *The Sac and Fox Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, the Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri, the Sac and Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa, et al., Petitioners v. The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2030. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 337, *Absentee Delaware Tribe of Oklahoma, et al., Petitioner v. The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2031. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 138, *The Iowa Tribe of the Iowa Reservation in Kansas and Nebraska, the Iowa Tribe of the Iowa Reservation in Oklahoma, et al., Omaha Tribe of Nebraska, et al., the Sac and*

Fox Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, the Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri, the Sac and Fox Tribe of Mississippi in Iowa, et al., Petitioners v. The United States of America, Defendant, pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2032. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on measures being taken to control the emission of air pollutants from Federal facilities, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-206; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2033. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of final evaluations of properties of certain carriers, pursuant to the provisions of section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 12752. A bill to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS:

H.R. 12753. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 12754. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 12755. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction or credit against the individual income tax for contributions made to National and State political committees or to certain other political organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 12756. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to provide that the President's annual report to Congress shall be submitted on or before March 31 of each year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 12757. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 12758. A bill to amend section 501(c)(14) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations organized to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARNUM:

H.R. 12759. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 12760. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction

from gross income for social agency, legal and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12761. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 12762. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 12763. A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12764. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12765. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to reduce the premiums charged for the insurance of certain cooperative housing mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12766. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to permit the more effective operation of the Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Fund; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 12767. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 12768. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide that certain forms of copper be admitted free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 12769. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 12770. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 12771. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 in order to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 12772. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12773. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as it relates to those areas to be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 12774. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide for the free importation of certain specialized educational equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 12775. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit certain activities in time of war or armed conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12776. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant leaves of absence with pay to personnel of the Department of Medicine and Surgery in certain instances if he determines that it will serve the national interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 12777. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 12778. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend to June 30, 1966, the period for initial enrollment in the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged provided under part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.J. Res. 833. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that certain activities shall be prohibited during a period of war or armed conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 834. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 586. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all foreign aid be suspended to countries maintaining diplomatic or trade relations with North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. Con. Res. 587. Concurrent resolution officially recognizing Waterloo, N.Y., as the birthplace of Memorial Day and authorizing the President to issue an appropriate proclamation relating to the centennial anniversary of the first celebration of Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H. Res. 727. Resolution relating to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 728. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the withdrawal of American troops from Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. Res. 729. Resolution in support of President Johnson's efforts to negotiate international agreements limiting the spread of nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 12779. A bill for the relief of Calogero Palermo and Adelina Turco Palermo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12780. A bill for the relief of Antonio Balsamo and Maria Balsamo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 12781. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mario Orlando Santos-Esteviz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 12782. A bill for the relief of Domenico Duca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 12783. A bill for the relief of Dr. Byung Du Hahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1966

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 26, 1966)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Remey L. Clem, rector, St. John's Military School, Salina, Kans., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, Our Heavenly Father, Thou whose infinite power created the unfathomable reaches of time and space yet who willest to live in the hearts of men, we thank Thee for all the blessings of life, and more especially, for Thy manifold gifts to our Nation. They are more than we could desire or pray for. Grant us an increasing awareness of Thy presence among us. Enlighten, we beseech Thee, those who sit in council, give purity of purpose to those who lead, and so transform the hearts of all men that they may place devotion to Thy purposes above personal gain. Bless our country that we may be a constant stronghold of righteousness and a champion of worthy causes. These things we ask through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1966—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 379)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966. If there is no objection, the message will be considered as read and appropriately referred.

The message was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganization of community relations functions in the area of civil rights.

After a careful review of the activities of the Federal agencies involved in the field of civil rights, it became clear that the elimination of duplication and undesirable overlap required the consolidation of certain functions.

As a first step, I issued Executive Orders No. 11246 and No. 11247 on September 24, 1965.

Executive Order No. 11246 simplified and clarified executive branch assignments of responsibility for enforcing civil rights policies and placed responsibility for the Government-wide coordination of the enforcement activities of executive agencies in the Secretary of Labor with respect to employment by Federal contractors and in the Civil Service Commission with respect to employment by Federal agencies.

Executive Order No. 11247 directed the Attorney General to assist Federal agencies in coordinating their enforcement activities with respect to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination in federally assisted programs.

As a further step for strengthening the operation and coordination of our civil rights programs, I now recommend transfer of the functions of the Community Relations Service, established in the Department of Commerce under title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to the Attorney General and transfer of the Service, including the office of Director, to the Department of Justice.

The Community Relations Service was located in the Department of Commerce by the Congress on the assumption that a primary need would be the conciliation of disputes arising out of the public accommodations title of the act. That decision was appropriate on the basis of information available at that time. The need for conciliation in this area has not been as great as anticipated because of the voluntary progress that has been made by businessmen and business organizations.

To be effective, assistance to communities in the identification and conciliation of disputes should be closely and tightly coordinated. Thus, in any particular situation that arises within a community, representatives of Federal agencies whose programs are involved should coordinate their efforts through a single agency. In recent years, the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department has played such a coordinating role in many situations, and has done so with great effectiveness.

Placing the Community Relations Service within the Justice Department will enhance the ability of the Justice Department to mediate and conciliate and will insure that the Federal Government speaks with a unified voice in those tense situations where the good offices of the Federal Government are called upon to assist.

In this, as in other areas of Federal operations, we will move more surely and rapidly toward our objectives if we improve Federal organization and the arrangements for interagency coordination. The accompanying reorganization plan has that purpose.

The present distribution of Federal civil rights responsibilities clearly indicates that the activities of the Community Relations Service will fit most appropriately in the Department of Justice.

The Department of Justice has primary program responsibilities in civil rights matters and deep and broad experience in the conciliation of civil rights disputes. Congress has assigned it a